

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and L. J. TRINTERUD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

VOL. XXII

DECEMBER, 1953

NO. 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORIGEN'S INTERPRETATION OF JUDAS ISCARIOT

Samuel Laeuchli 253

THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION IN ESTONIA

Karl Laantee 269

AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM DURING THE

REVOLUTIONARY EPOCH

Sidney E. Mead 279

THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH AND THE HOME

MISSIONARY MOVEMENT BEFORE 1863

Glenn Weaver 298

POBEDONOSTSEV'S RELIGIOUS POLITICS

Arthur E. Adams 314

CONTENTS

SURVEYS

- ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY Robert M. Grant, 327
- JESUIT MISSIONS THROUGH THE EIGHTEENTH
CENTURY R. Pierce Beaver, 329

BOOK REVIEWS

- MCNEILL, J. T.: *A History of the Cure of Souls* Philip Rieff
- BORNKAMM, G.: *Das Ende des Gesetzes* Robert M. Grant
- MESSINGER, R. E.: *The Medieval Latin Hymn* Allen Cabaniss
- BOYD, CATHERINE E.: *Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy* Ray C. Petry
- MOORMAN, J. R. H.: *The Grey Friars in Cambridge, 1225-1538*
..... Percy V. Norwood
- BROMILEY, G. W. (ED.): *Zwingli and Bullinger* Gaius Jackson Slosser
- DILLENBERGER, J.: *God Hidden and Revealed* . . . Jaroslav Pelikan
- BAILEY, D. S.: *Thomas Becon and the Reformation*
in England Winthrop S. Hudson
- GRATZ, D. L.: *Bernese Anabaptists and Their*
American Descendants Cornelius Krahn
- ROSSITER, CLINTON: *Seedtime of the Republic* . . . Robert T. Handy
- MAY, H. G.: *Our English Bible in the Making* Allen Wikgren

ORIGEN'S INTERPRETATION OF JUDAS ISCARIOT

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI

The post-apostolic generation was not interested in the person who, according to all four gospels, betrayed Jesus the day before his death. This whole episode remained a rather dark spot for the young church, which was in constant self-defence against the manifold powers of the pagan world. It is not astonishing, therefore, that the apologetic literature of the second century carefully avoided this subject. The Judas legend, developing more and more the evil character and the horrible end of the betrayer, does not even appear in the second century writings of Justin, Hermas, and Clement, and we would not know anything about it if Irenaeus and the Catenas of the church had not preserved the Papias fragments for us.¹ The apologetic literature had no use for it.

The first to meditate on the figure of the betrayer were the Gnostics. Unfortunately one cannot say just what their speculations amounted to. The accusations of Irenaeus against the Judas of the Valentinean sect as being an "image and symbol of the suffering Aeon" are too vague and too subjective to reveal precisely the conceptions of the Gnostic theology.² Certain elements within Gnosticism made a divine being out of Judas.³

After the church had laid some solid grounds for its existence as an organized body within the Roman Empire, and after an apologetic battle of more than a century, the theologians were enabled for the first time to bring up systematic and historical questions. The Alexandrians worked out their dogmatic systems, and Tertullian dealt with a vast number of topics. The commentaries arose. Now the church was given time and opportunity to think of Judas Iscariot, not always *sine ira et studio*, to be sure, but at least without a feeling of fear and continuous self-defence. At this point we find Origen. He was the first to deal with the tremendous historical and theological problems of the event of the betrayal. For many centuries, the theologians of the church depended almost entirely upon his views. It is unfortunate again that part of the texts dealing with Judas exist only in the later Latin version, sometimes more accurate perhaps than Rufinus' translation but still not altogether trustworthy. And yet, what has survived, both in the Latin and the original Greek texts, still shows remarkably well the attempts of a Christian thinker to understand the betrayal of Judas, the disciple from Keriot.

For the simple Christian believer, Judas is the personification of evil, the prototype of the bad, covetous, and unfaithful, a thief and murderer of the worst kind.⁴ The Judas legend, which had already

arisen in the time of the Apostles, is a good sign of the desire to discover more and more ugly tendencies in the life of the twelfth disciple and to represent his death as being as frightful as possible.⁶ Chrysostom preached a famous sermon about Judas, showing the fatal lust for money as the basis of all evil, as the cause which brought Judas to perdition.⁷

Origen, the theologian of Alexandria, thinks about Judas more carefully. He realizes from the very beginning that more is involved than an ordinary bribe. If Judas were just an evil doer like so many others Jesus met during his lifetime, one would not need to spend so much time on him. But after all, he was a disciple of the Lord! He was elected by him, ate with him, and listened to him for many, many months.⁸ How could Christ take a thief and betrayer among his closest followers? How could it happen? How did it happen? An immense field of questions and problems opens up as soon as Origen begins to meditate on Judas Iscariot.

To be sure, Judas still is regarded by Origen as the covetous keeper of the moneybag, as he is shown in the fourth gospel. Judas did not care for the poor but kept, as a thief, what had been thrown into the moneybag.⁹ As one who "loved money,"¹⁰ he spoke up for the poor but embezzled what had been given for their sake.¹¹ The lust for money which Judas had in him was indeed the root of all the evil that befell Jesus; it was the very beginning of his bad actions.¹² He wanted to receive money and betray the Word of God.¹³

These accusations against Judas as a hypocritical embezzler and thief, however, are seldom to be found in Origen's commentaries. He did not throw stones thoughtlessly at the man from Keriot.¹⁴ He does not have any doubt about the authenticity of the theft and the moneybag affair, as many scholars would indeed today, but it does not play a key role in his view of Judas. He does not give admittance, either, to any apocryphal Judas traditions in his many passages on this subject.¹⁵ He does not, because he sees tremendous implications behind the betrayer and his act. Origen is concerned with something ultimate in his dealing with Judas.

Was Judas from the very beginning of his life, or even from the moment he became one of the twelve disciples, a sinful man? This is the first question Origen has in mind. Did Christ on purpose take an unpleasant, money-conscious person among his disciples, who, although he had been trusted with the moneybag, from the very beginning embezzled alms given by the listeners of the Messiah? Origen denies this throughout his commentaries. It is not true, as some of his contemporaries believe, that Judas was "incapable of salvation according to his nature"¹⁶ He was not driven to create evil from his

first breath but had received the same possibility as other human beings to choose between the good and the bad; he did possess a free will.¹⁷ One might agree with this interpretation of Origen but still claim that Judas never made use of his freedom of choice but turned toward evil throughout his career. Again, Origen violently objects: Judas did choose and do something good in his life as a disciple of the Lord. One finds some interesting points proving this statement.

In the scene where the disciples asked their master who among them would be capable of doing the devilish act of betraying, they could not know it had to be Judas because of the good that he had done before.¹⁸ They did not suspect anything evil about him. This is a clever point: why would the disciples have had to ask Jesus or even tell Peter to put the subtle and embarrassing question if Judas had been a sinner and thief? He could not have lived with them, doing evil and stealing alms, without its being known at least to some extent. Origen cannot believe that Judas was a thief from the very moment they gave him the moneybag. He was "worthy to receive confidence."¹⁹ They trusted him. Not only the disciples but Christ also had faith in him. Origen demonstrates this in relating Ps. 40,10 (LXX) to the relationship between Jesus and Judas. The betrayer once was a "man of peace" and Christ had hoped very much for him. He had put all hope in him as in a good apostle.²⁰ And the discipleship of Judas was not hypocritical; he did believe in Jesus honestly, genuinely.²¹ The conception of a twelfth disciple who so-to-speak only participates in the activities of the others, in reality untouched by the preaching and acting of Christ, is thus sharply refused. He shared not only the benefits of his fellow disciples but also their faith.

Two examples sustain this assumption even more. Before his going up to Jerusalem for his last week, Jesus took the twelve apart and told them, as though in secret, what was to happen to him in the holy city. (Matth. 20,17). In this scene, Judas must have been present, for the Scripture does not say that Jesus excluded anyone from hearing his secret prediction but affirms that the twelve were taken apart by him. Therefore, Judas, at this stage, was still worthy of being taken aside together with the other eleven.²² Soon afterwards (Matth. 20,20 sqq.), the mother of the two sons of Zebedee came to Jesus and asked her selfish question about having her sons sitting one on the right hand and the other on the left hand of Christ in the kingdom of God. Jesus refused this improper demand harshly and Matthew tells us that the ten hearing this were moved with indignation concerning the sons of Zebedee. One of the ten indignant disciples was Judas. The text does not say nine but ten. And Origen expressly notices that Mark tells the same.²³ The first implication is that Judas had

not yet by this time turned to the bad but still realized and rejected the egoistic demand of this mother. Origen says it in his own way: while he was among the indignant, the devil had not yet put it into his heart to betray the Lord. He was still one of the apostles.

Some other passages show the same. Before the soul of Judas was injured (by the devil and the intention of betraying), it was "*quasi* a vineyard in blossom", possessing full freedom of will.²⁴ One could not express more beautifully his apostleship than Origen does here. In the exegesis of Miriam's song (Ex. 15, 1-2) Origen makes the anagogical distinction between "horses" on which the devil and his angels ride and "horses" which have the Lord as the rider (Hab. 3,8 LXX). Judas had the Lord once as a rider and belonged to the cavalcade of salvation: *de equitatu fuit salutis*.²⁵

This makes clear enough how Origen sees in the life of Judas an extended period in which he was neither traitor, disbeliever, nor thief. He quotes Matthew as a supporter who never, before the beginning of the betrayal, accuses Judas, except by mentioning in the list of apostles "Judas, who betrayed him."²⁶ The term "accuse" astonishes one. What one suspects all the way through the given passages becomes manifest here: Origen makes these statements in sharp contradiction to certain trends within the church—the large group of believers who carried and developed the Judas legend—which increasingly reproached Judas for everything and painted him as the black sheep from the very beginning. Matthew does not accuse him of anything, Origen declares. And he sees in this *argumentum e silentio* another proof for the innocence of Judas during his first period of being a disciple. If there had been anything bad, Matthew would have reproached him for it. All he mentions is the betrayal.

This originally good and trustworthy apostle proceeded to betray his master. Meditating carefully on the process of this betrayal, Origen takes the account of the gospel of John very seriously, for the part of the devil, and systematizes it. He makes out of John 13,2 and 13,27 two important, different steps in Judas' entering the world of evil and, from it, differentiates the whole first part of the act of betraying into two stages: first, the devil put it into the heart of Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot, to betray Jesus; and second, Satan himself entered Judas.²⁷ Between the two lay the washing of the feet and the last supper. The two stages are very important for Origen; over and over again he distinguishes one from the other.

As Judas was going up to Jerusalem, the devil had not yet put it into his heart to betray the Lord. He still was, and acted like, a true apostle, and none of the others had the slightest notion about the repulsive discovery which was waiting for them in the very near

future. As a matter of fact, not even Judas knew yet what he was about to do!²⁸ But then, when he arrived in Jerusalem, the fatal turn came: the devilish intention came into his heart. The devil, watching for an object for his destructive plans, found Judas, and put this plan into his heart. A picture taken from Eph. 6,16 is used for it: the devil tried to shoot his fiery darts into the soul of Judas.²⁹ And he succeeded.

Only twice Origen does come forth with an explanation as to why the devil could succeed and why Judas let this first of all the destructive steps happen. Once in the Commentary on John he declares that the devil was given a chance to shoot his fire-arrows because he did not find Judas clad in the armor of God and holding the shield of faith with which he would have been able to extinguish the burning arrows.³⁰ A lack of faith accounts for the vulnerable heart of Judas, on the one side. One finds a second explanation in the late Matthew Commentary: the lust for money in Judas is the very root of all the evil that happened to Jesus. Because he actually embezzled money intended for the poor, although he seemingly spoke up for them, his soul became hurt and the devil was given a chance to shoot.³¹ These are two different answers, either of them in partial contradiction to other statements of Origen. It will be shown later why Origen did not deal more thoroughly with the initiation of the devil's plan within the heart of Judas.

After the first attempt by Satan, Judas Iscariot was by no means altogether lost in wickedness.³² As a matter of fact, Christ tried to prevent an increase of the devil's influence by trusting him with the moneybag, so that he would abstain from his evil desire, being in possession of what he loved so much.³³ The event of the last supper, however, brought the final decision. And the scene of the presentation of the sop to Judas is the main factor in Origen's interpretation. This is the way he explains what actually happened and why after the sop Satan was enabled to enter the betrayer. According to Matth. 25,29, from him that has not shall be taken away even that which he seems to have, and according to Luke 10,6, where there is a son of peace, the peace given by the disciples shall rest upon him; if not, however, the peace shall turn back to the spender again. Thus, Christ, in presenting the sop to Judas, was willing to give him "something specific": his peace. But because Judas was already unworthy of that which Jesus offered to him, he lost whatever he still seemed to possess. Christ received back the spiritual gift he was offering, and the peace was taken away from Judas. He was "robbed", drained of what he called his own during all of his discipleship. Now, there was room for the devil; the heart of the betrayer was open. Satan entered.

He had watched carefully for the occasion until it appeared.³⁴ Origen leaves open the question whether Judas actually ate the sop or whether the devil, fearing an undesirable resurgence of better elements within Judas, prevented him from eating it. One is inclined to think that Origen leaned toward the latter but was not actually certain of it.³⁵

After the sop "which perhaps was not eaten by Judas," the devil entered.³⁶ Jesus watched Satan go in.³⁷ Judas had given him room in his heart.³⁸ As the decisive second step in betraying Jesus, he received "the whole Satan" in him.³⁹ Not just thought, plans, intentions, but the totality of the devil entered him. The prince of persecution took possession of him.⁴⁰ And so much were they one, Judas and Satan, that Origen is not even sure whether after this invasion Jesus spoke to Judas or to the devil in him: "What thou doest, do quickly."⁴¹

From then on, the whole world of evil and guilt broke forth in Judas. The devil was his father,⁴² his rider who guided his bridle,⁴³ who opened his mouth in order to talk to the Pharisees.⁴⁴ He wanted money in order to betray the Word of God; he went to the priests and discussed with them the thirty pieces of silver.⁴⁵ Even to have dipped his hand in the dish with Jesus was arrogant of Judas;⁴⁶ now he left to betray Christ fully.⁴⁷ Darkness fell upon Judas, leading him into the abyss, while the other disciples, cleaned and purified, followed the Brightest Day.⁴⁸ He was a servant of betrayal, a slave of sin, a minister of Satan.⁴⁹ He indeed had eaten the sop for his own judgment.⁵⁰

Thus, he went away, not only from the house of the last supper, but from Christ altogether.⁵¹ He ceased to be a disciple of the Lord.⁵²

"An evil tree cannot bring forth any good fruit." Already in the time of Origen, there were people who referred this parable by Jesus to human nature, anticipating therewith in some way the Calvinistic doctrine of double predestination. God created some creatures to honor, some to shame. In a vivid contradiction to such a thought, Origen accuses those people of reproaching God for iniquity. And the figure of Judas itself represents to him a strong proof of the foolishness of such "fables." If any man on earth had a "lost nature" it was Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. If now it were true that such a lost nature were incapable of any good action, how could it have happened that Judas, after his betrayal, after the worst act ever achieved on earth, could take the thirty silver pieces back and bring forth the sentence of penitence: "I have betrayed innocent blood"?⁵³ This is the beginning of Origen's passage dealing with the penance and death of Judas, the last scene in the life of the betrayer.

Judas did repent. The fact that he could and actually did confess his sins and that a most extreme grief and mourning came over

him in his repentance, is for Origen one of the strong grounds for rejecting the ridiculing reproach by Celsus that Jesus was betrayed by his own disciples.⁵⁴ Judas, facing the enormous extent of his evil act, indeed repented, and from the contrition of his heart, confessed his sin.⁵⁵ The series of the Commentary on Matthew preserves for us an interesting and undoubtedly genuine explanation why the betrayer became suddenly capable of viewing his own sinful act. Satan, having entered Judas after the sop, remained present within him until Jesus was sent to Pilate; after having achieved, however, what he intended, he withdrew from Judas. And now the betrayer suddenly realized why, having betrayed innocent blood, he was to be condemned by God. With the devil no longer in him, he became able to understand.⁵⁶ This closes the circle that began at the scene with the sop. As soon as Satan had taken possession of Judas, the last remains of his once good nature became inoperative and whatever he did, all during the actual betraying, was as evil as anything could be, with the devil as his own father within him. When Satan left him again, something came back from his nature before the betrayal. He became conscious; he was able to see.

Other factors also are taken into account for the tact of Judas' repentance. A last remnant of his once good will must have realized the awfulness of his act,⁵⁷ for not every sense of good had been expelled from his soul or he would not have repented.⁵⁸ The teachings of Jesus, not wholly despised and abominated by Judas, were able to bring forth in him some repentance⁵⁹—the power of Christ's resurrection or the thought of the once predicted resurrection.⁶⁰ In any case he did understand something of the Saviour's greatness. Origen argues, in throwing the thirty silver pieces nowhere else but into the temple, the place he knew Christ had cleansed by chasing out the oxen and merchants.⁶¹

This penitence, however, was not the right one.⁶² He did not repent, according to his own conscience, as he should have repented. And Origen gives an astonishing reason for this false contrition: Judas meant to anticipate Jesus in his death in order to receive *misericordia* from him.⁶³ Again, the devil is involved,⁶⁴ he never leaves a human being without having a positive desire to reenter. Thus, Satan overloaded him with exorbitant sadness which Judas did not reject, so that he was pushed by it into death.⁶⁵

There was a chance for Judas. Origen does not believe that the fact of betraying Christ excluded all possibility for forgiveness and full cleansing. Judas could have done what the malefactor on the cross did: asked Jesus for forgiveness by saying, "Remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom," and he would have received atonement for the betrayal.⁶⁶

He certainly had a chance, instead of hanging himself, of finding him who had spoken before: I do not want the death of the sinner but his penance.⁶⁷ This is a consequent expression of Origen's belief in the reconciliation of the cosmos. And yet, it is astonishing, indeed, that in the whole exegesis of the story of the passion in the Commentary on John—which is fully preserved in the original text and in which he would have had many occasions to do so—he never speaks of the reconciliation of Judas as one would expect from that much quoted passage in his *Peri Archon*! He does not even hint at it.⁶⁸ To be sure, he does not claim either any damnation or future penalty. All he says is: Judas, having had, after his worst act, a chance of reconciliation, did not take advantage of it but became his own judge.⁶⁹ Beyond this, Origen does not dare to make any statement. If he had wanted to, *John Comm.* XXXII, would have been the place for it. This is another example as to how mistaken one can be in judging Origen only from *Peri Archon* and its dubious fragments from the time of Justinian.⁷⁰

This is the development of the life of Judas, as Origen has it in mind. On the whole, one finds it a rather unified and coherent account of the betrayal. Judas, originally a good and promising disciple, received some devilish ideas in his heart to betray his master to the Jews. He only had it in mind, though, not yet being capable of realizing his intention. The scene with the sop brought the final decision. The devil entered him, and then the betrayal occurred. But Judas, when the devil left him shortly after this, suddenly became aware of his atrocious act, repented in great despair and, partly by a wrong kind of repentance, partly by another urging by the devil, hanged himself. Origen accepts the account of Judas as given in the gospel of John in preference to the account as given in the Synoptics, and finds in it a rather coherent interpretation of the character and act of Judas. However, this is not the whole problem of Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. It is only the prelude Origen has given thus far, and he knows it. Why has Judas been made an apostle by the son of God in spite of God's foreknowledge? Was he elected to be a betrayer? This is the first tremendous problem. And who is responsible for the betrayal? This is the second.

To begin with, Origen insists that Judas possessed a full apostleship. He was "a good apostle" on whom Jesus had put "a good hope."⁷¹ He shared with the disciples the "secret and nourishing words" which the Saviour spoke,⁷² i.e. he participated entirely in the exclusiveness in which Jesus and his disciples were joined together, without ever being a stumbling block or an outsider before the thought of betrayal arose. He had possession of what belonged to Jesus.⁷³

The unity between Judas and Jesus could not possibly be expressed in stronger terms. And also in comparison to the other disciples, he was not an inferior figure among the twelve but "exalted" like them, living in apostolic order.⁷⁴ Together with them, he had known him, listened to his teaching,⁷⁵ sat at his table and eaten with him.⁷⁶ Nothing therefore distinguished him from his fellow disciples all during the first period of his being with Jesus. It is not a matter of course to uphold the idea of the unimpaired apostleship of Judas. The tendency all through history has been to augment the length of time of evil-doing to cover the man's life and to make disappear whatever values he once had possessed.

As truly as Judas had once lived in apostolic order, as truly he lost it. He was thrown to the last place,⁷⁷ and, having become a slave of sin, he was no longer a servant of the Word of God.⁷⁸ His apostleship was lost and Matthias received his place.⁷⁹ As Peter is the first of the Twelve, Judas finally indeed is the last.⁸⁰

Did Jesus know about this fatal turn in his disciple? And if he knew, why did he not prevent it? In the midst of Origen's dealing with the fact that previously Judas was worthy, having found confidence and having been a real hope in Christ's mind, the theologian of Alexandria remembers that God could not have watched all this without the slightest notion of what Judas some day might undertake, and he intrudes the sentence: "although he was foreknown as one who would fall."⁸¹ This is the difficult question one always will face in dealing with the betrayal of Judas: God knew it would happen but why did it happen in spite of this foreknowledge? Did Judas therefore act out of pure necessity? Origen does not hesitate to come forth with his answer.

Judas had, according to the famous third book of *Peri Archon*: the *autexousion*, free will, as everyone else does. Like all human beings, he had the possibility of choice between God and evil.⁸² On the other side, (of course) there is a foreknowledge, *praescientia*. But that which has been foreknown does not necessarily have to happen!⁸³ The disciples knew this. When Jesus in an indefinite fashion spoke about one of the disciples betraying him, they asked him who it would be, well aware that a decision once made could be changed.⁸⁴ And Origen proves this necessity of a possible change from the Old Testament prediction about Judas; if the prophets condemn and blame Judas for his betrayal, predicting his betrayal, this blame would not have any meaning if Judas with absolute necessity had had to become a traitor and had not had the chance of becoming like the other apostles, i.e. if he could not have decided not to sin.⁸⁵ After Jesus watched the devil put it into the heart of Judas to betray his master, he foresaw what was to come

afterwards.⁸⁶ But he tried to grasp the injured soul of Judas, to keep it away from the evil. For this reason he trusted him with the money-bag.⁸⁷ The attempt of Christ failed; through his free will, led astray by the devil, Judas chose against Christ. This means that the hopes of Christ for Judas had not simply potential meaning and that the earlier goodness in which Judas was taken by Jesus was not a farce or a semblance. When Jesus promises some blessing to his disciples, he does not actually make this promise to eleven only. Origen *expressis verbis* refuses this interpretation. The blessing is true for anyone, even for Judas.⁸⁸ His decision therefore is not a mere scene in a play, all figured out beforehand, but an actual choice, realized in actual life.

This is the Origenistic primacy of the free will, applied to the betrayal of Judas. Its proclamation might be even more distinct if we had the crucial Greek texts of the Commentary on Matthew in its original form, but it still can be drawn understandably enough from the pen of the Latin interpreter, proved by similar Greek passages, that Origen gives also in this respect a consistent picture of Judas. It amounts after all to a certain limitation of the *praescientia Dei*. Origen is not willing to admit a cosmological or soteriological necessity of this betrayal of Judas, very well aware that his freedom of will thus would be merely seeming. There is one important factor responsible for creating the theological problem of Judas which Origen does not even mention (whether he did not see it or whether he did not want to see it, one can never know, of course): the sentence of Jesus that the Son of Man *had* to be betrayed. From this idea, the whole conception of Judas as an apostle, predicted as a betrayer in the Old Testament, would be difficult to combine with the disciple who acted on his fully free will, while even Christ tried to change any *praescientia* toward his disciple. Origen sees instead of a necessity much more the soteriological drama—instead of a plan, an historical decision between the betrayer and the Christ.

We have spoken of freedom, of personal decision. This is only one angle of the problem. What is the devil's role in this decision, in the betrayal? Origen's representation poses a great question in this respect. If Satan himself having put it first into the heart of Judas to betray the Christ, entered into, and therefore was part of, Judas, he actually did the betraying, did he not? Indeed, Origen has certain passages in which he stresses the acting of the devil so much that it seems as if Judas was completely passive in the whole actual betraying. For instance, the "going away" of Judas, Origen explains, comes from the fact that the devil could not endure it to be in the same place Jesus was. And the argument for this is: there is no community between Christ and Beliar.⁸⁹ Origen goes even one step further: Judas

and Satan are so much one, that it is almost impossible to make any distinction between them. When Christ by name summons Judas to the betrayal by saying: "What thou doest, do quickly," one is not even sure whether Christ said this sentence to Judas or to the devil in Judas! Origen carefully examines the situation and comes to the conclusion that both are possible and one never will be able to make out which of the two was meant: whether Christ had challenged the "Antagonist" for the battle or whether he thus told the betrayer to enter the service of the divine "economy."⁹⁰

This is quite another aspect of the betrayal which Origen brings forward in these words, and because this aspect is extremely important for him, he stresses so much the entering of the devil into Judas. The betrayal is no longer simply a human error, an event of utmost faithlessness within the circle of the twelve, but rises to be a cosmic event, the last attempt of Satan to conquer the son of God, to destroy Jesus of Nazareth. The one of the *Archons* who fell from heaven like lightning⁹¹ is involved in this betrayal, a power far above the human character of a Judas. Christ and Beliar, Christ and Satan, is the decisive alternative therein.⁹²

This view of the betrayal implies a certain discharge of Judas. If it was Satan, within Judas, of course, who could not stand it any longer to be together with Jesus at the same place,⁹³ and if the devil opened the mouth of Judas to talk to the Pharisees and Elders,⁹⁴ then he is really the active figure in the procedure of the betraying. He has the main responsibility. Origen once mentions that the devil could have been afraid Judas would receive some support and assistance by eating the sop Jesus offered and therefore could have hindered him from eating it.⁹⁵ This implies that the devil even used force with Judas in taking possession of him. He was not willing even to give Judas a chance to cling to something else; Judas was his servant⁹⁶ within whom he acted.

Nobody would deny that after these aspects the consequent maintenance of the free decision on the side of Judas becomes more than questionable. If it is the devil who has possession of Judas, how can he still be the responsible actor? In modern language we would say he was not even in his full senses, so much was he in the power of the devil. Here, Origen might answer that the decision fell when Judas gave space for the devilish thought in his heart the first time, and when he later on let the devil in. The decision was made at the very beginning when, because of some lack of faith and his lust for money, Judas made it possible for Satan to shoot his fiery arrows.⁹⁷ Judas therefore was responsible at the very beginning, making the betrayal possible by letting the Satan's thoughts and afterwards Satan him-

self enter. Then, the devil himself did the betraying while Judas remained merely a subordinate servant until he realized, after the exit of Satan, what he had done.

I am not altogether certain that this actually would have been the answer of Origen to the question of freedom and serving the devil. To begin with, Origen did not dwell upon this entering motivation very much. He uses it mostly as a warning to the Christians: let not the devil shoot any arrows, beware of embezzling any ecclesiastical money, keep the shield of faith.⁹⁸ If everything really had depended upon this one and only moment, Origen certainly would have meditated more about it, would have explained it over and over, the way he repeated himself about the fact of the devil's entrance, the penance of Judas and the effect it all had on the betrayer. And most of all why then did Origen not make clear what the relation would be between this decision and responsibility of Judas, and the participation of the devil? After all, you could not talk about a cosmic antithesis: Christ—Lucifer, and then place the whole responsibility on Judas, the human servant of the latter!

There are people who believe that because Origen wrote the first Christian Dogmatics and because he created the first system of theology within the church, everything he wrote had to be put *à tout prix* into some system, somehow or another. The commentaries, his exegetical attempts, show clearly enough how wrong this is. The question of Judas proves it again. On one side, the betrayal of Judas is his own act, and he had a chance to do something different;⁹⁹ on the other hand, as has been shown in this paragraph, he does it as a servant of the devil, in the midst of a fight which lay far above his own realm and control. This is the dialectical situation in his Judas problem, a *factum* of which Origen was aware.¹⁰⁰ He deals with both, the particular decision of Judas and the transcendent part of the devil. Sometimes, he stresses more the one side of it, sometimes he is forced to dwell more on the other. On the whole, it seems that the devil is more attacked than Judas; and some texts even may give the impression of a full discharge of Judas. Nevertheless, one cannot find any statement holding apart the human and the Satanic share of responsibility in this betrayal of Christ.

At the very basis of this dialectical situation lies another insight of Origen, an extraordinarily important one for the whole question of Judas and at the same time perhaps the most difficult of all: the *oikonomia*. When Jesus spoke his "what thou doest, do quickly," he either summoned the devil for the decisive fight or he told Judas to be now a servant for the divine economy, i.e. God's plan in Christ to save the human race.¹⁰¹ And Origen sees the connection of the two:

the economy of God begins to enter its crucial moment with the betrayal, because the betrayal is the entrance to the cycle of passion, death, and resurrection. In this way, Origen dares to say that the beginning of the divine economy has been made with Judas' going away from Jesus after the sop.¹⁰² The relation between God's saving plan and the betrayal cannot be denied, for the divine plan leads to the passion,¹⁰³ exactly the same as the betrayal.¹⁰⁴

If this parallelism is true, a new aspect enters the history of the betrayal. The betrayal of Judas, in some way, becomes a part of the economy. If this economy had its climax in death and resurrection and if the capture by the Jews was the beginning of Christ's way to the cross, then obviously the betrayal by Judas, facilitating the task of the Jews, had its place in the midst of this economy! Origen, however, does not deal with this idea just as he does not touch the problem of the necessity of Judas. Perhaps he was not aware of what his parallelism between Judas and the divine plan means; perhaps, he was afraid of the conclusions that might be drawn from such a consequence to the act of Judas; perhaps, also, it might have been too risky to deal with such a difficult and even insoluble problem in a commentary meant to benefit the believers of the Church. One is rather inclined to think that Origen did not systematically think about this angle of the problem, but simply presented some aspects which came into his mind. To some extent, also, he must have been aware of the enormous difficulties of the whole question of Judas.

And yet, in spite of the lack of information given about this angle of the subject, there is one astonishing thought which Origen brings up, which shows us that this theologian thought and thought about the problems of faith, and that he did not hesitate to say what he perceived to be true. If Judas really has a part to play within the divine economy, does not, to some extent, the betrayal go back to God himself? For God wanted the sacrifice of his son and Christ did not flee from his death, but went into it aware of what a tremendous work he was doing for the world. The betrayal therefore did not so much work against as for the saving plan God had in mind in Christ. Two texts of Origen, one in Latin, one a Greek Catena, deal with this. In one, he combines the text of Matthew (that Christ was delivered) with Romans 8:32 (that God did not spare his only son but delivered him up for us all) and comes to the conclusion that actually they all delivered Christ: the Father—Judas—Satan—the High Priests. The Latin text is not trustworthy enough to stress every detail but one thing comes out sharply enough: that the line of responsibility is traced back to God. God betrayed (delivered) him because of his mercy toward the human race.¹⁰⁵ This is, indeed, Paul's idea of Romans 8 ap-

plied to the betrayal of Judas, and this Latin passage on the whole is proved by an interesting fragment of the *Lost Commentary on Luke*. In it, Origen reminds one of the fact that Judas and the other people in the betrayal were human beings, while (quoting the same passage from the *Epistle to the Romans* as in the other text!) Paul speaks about God's delivering his only Son. And Origen asks whether one could not say that God is implied in the phrase "he is delivered." The fragment ends with a typically Origenistic distinction and combination of two contradicting statements. They both betrayed Christ: Judas on one hand, because of the money, "in hostile intention"; God on the other, "in a beneficent way."¹⁰⁶ This does not solve anything, of course, and, after this statement, one would really have to begin all over again and deal with Judas Iscariot once more, looking at it from this angle. One does not need to. What Origen does in this last *Catena* text is to leave the problem of Judas in a dialectical confrontation, and this probably will happen whenever Christians think about the theological implications of the betrayal, behind which lies the question of the reality of evil in its relation to God. Here is Judas, and to omit any active part on his side means to land in a monistic neoplatonism; there is God, and to leave him out would make the world an immanent realm and the death of Christ a result of merely historical constellations. One understands from this point of view why in Origen's commentaries sometimes one angle, sometimes an opposite one, is developed. He is not willing to sacrifice either the human responsibility nor the devil's participation nor the presence of God in the life of Christ.

It was a wise word of Origen's when he said that there is a mystery in the betrayal of Judas against Jesus.¹⁰⁷

1. Funk-Bihlmeyer: *Apost. Väter*, Tübingen 1924. pp. 134-137. Ir. *Adv. Haer.* 5,33,3 [GCS I, 268]. As for the early Judas legend, cf. also: the *Gospel of Bartholomew* (in *Les Apocryphes Coptes* I, 1907 *Patribl. Orient.* 2) and the Coptic fragments in Haase: *Lit. Untersuchungen zur Orient. apokr. Evang. Literatur*, Leipzig 1913, pp. 11 sqq., and Zoëga: *Cat. cod. copt.*, Rom 1810. p. 230.
2. Ir. *Adv. Haer.* II, 20, 2 and II, 20, 4.
3. One branch of the Gnostic sect of the "Cainites" worshipped Judas Iscariot who "alone recognized the truth" and who "separated the earthly from the divine." They possessed the *Gospel of Judas*. Hippolytus: *Synt. in Ps. Tert.* 2, Epiph.: *Haer.* 38,1 sqq., and Ir.: *Adv. Haer.* I 31, 1.
4. Cf. the introduction of Klostermann's critical edition of the *Matthew Com-*

mentary in GCS (*Die griech. christlichen Schriftsteller*).

5. Quid Juda pejus! Aug. *Tract. Joh.* 50, 10. The few comments of Origen's immediate predecessors in the East and in the West, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, show the same attitude of the common faith, so different from Origen's profound insight into the Judas questions: Cl. Al. *Paed.* II, 8 (§62,363,1), Tert. *Enn. in Ps.* 39 and *Enn. in Ps.* 40. The most typical book ever written in this respect probably is: Abraham de Santa Clara: *Judas, der Erzscheim*, Salzburg 1686, part of it republished in 1906.
6. Cf. P. B. Franklin: "The mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot" in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXXI, 481-632.
7. *Migne Ser. Gr.* 50, pp. 373, sqq.

8. *John Comm.* XXXII, 18 [235, 237]
9. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 82 (lat.) Between [] the reference numbers in GCS.
10. *John Comm.* XXXII, 10 [109]
11. *philargyresas, Matth. Comm.* XVI, 8
12. *Matth. Comm.* XI, 9 and *Comm. on Cant. Cant.* IV (lat.)
13. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 78 (lat.)
14. There is something evil in the best Christian,—as one can see in the lives of the saints—, and there is something good in the worst of the bad, even in Judas. *Comm. on Rom.* IX, 41 (Ruf.)
15. Cf. Footnote 1, and further: Hippolytus: 4, 60 (GCS I, 339), Aphraat: *Hom.* 14, Ephr. Syr. cf. Zahn: *Forschungen* I, 212, and the two Papias traditions in Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* III, 39 and Funk-Bihlmeyer: *loc. cit.*
16. *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 [246]
17. *Cant. Cant. Comm.* IV, certainly the Latin equivalent of the Origenistic *autezouision*.
18. *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 [240-241]
19. *John Comm.* XXXII, 14 [161]
20. *Ibid.* [157-158 and 162]
21. *Ibid.* 159. Otherwise, Jesus would not have sent Judas with the other apostles: the close relationship of *apostolos* and *apostellein*. Cf. also: *Luke-Hom.* I 89 [GCS p. 8, 12]: he was an "eye-witness" of the Lord.
22. *Matth. Comm.* XVI, 2
23. *Matth. Comm.* XVI, 8
24. *Comm. on Cant. Cant.* IV (lat.) (De-LaRue p. 92)
25. *Ex. Hom.* VI, 2 (Ruf.) [VI, 193, 10]
26. *Matth. Comm.* XVI, 2
27. The devil did not enter Judas before, he only put it into his heart to betray Jesus. After the sop, he entered. *John Comm.* XXXII, 22 [286], and the Greek fragment to Ex. 20, 5-6 (lat: *Ex-Hom.* VIII, 6) [GCS VI 230 sqq.]
28. *Matth. Comm.* XVI, 2 and XVI, 8
29. *John Comm.* XXXII, 2 [19/23] *Matth. Comm.* XI, 9
30. *John Comm.* XXXII, 2 [19]
31. *Matth. Comm.* XI, 9
32. *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 [241]
33. *Cant. Cant. Comm.* IV (lat.)
34. *John Comm.* XXXII, 22 [280-285]
35. Cf. the discussion in *John Comm.* XXXII, 24 [306-311] with the concluding statement of uncertainty in [312]. The Roman Catholic historians are inclined to pay too much attention to the problem of the Judas communion in Origen. (Donatus Haug: *Judas Ischarioth, der Verräther*, München 1936). It is wrong to treat the Origenistic Eucharist, the *trophikoi artoi aletheias*, from the Thomistic aspect of the *opus operatum* and the communion dogma of 1215. The way Origen deals with the question whether Judas ate the sop or not (*loc. cit.*) shows that this is not a vital problem in his conception of the *eucharistia* the way it is, of course, for the dogma of the Fourth Lateran Council.
36. *Ibid.* [306] and *John Comm.* XXXII, 30 [382]
37. *John Comm.* XXXII, 23 [299]
38. *John Comm.* XXXII, 22 [283]
39. *P.A.* III, 2, 1 (Ruf.) [GCS V, 246, 13]
40. *Ex. Hom.* XIII, 1 (Ruf.) [VIII, 442, 16]
41. *John Comm.* XXXII, 23 [297]
42. *Ex. Hom.* VIII, 6 (Ruf. and a Greek fragment) [VI 230 sqq.]
43. *Ex. Hom.* VI, 2 (Ruf.) [VI 193, 10 sqq.]
44. *Ex. Hom.* III, 2 (Ruf.) [VI 163, 10 sqq.]
45. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 78 (lat.)
46. *John Comm.* XXXII, 22 [290]
47. In *Peri Archon* II 3, 4, Origen says that Judas betrayed the Lord twice. If Rufinus translated right, it either means the two steps of betraying as shown before, or the betrayal in talking to the Pharisees as the first step, and the actual betrayal in Gethsemane as the second.
48. *John Comm.* XXXII, 24 [313-317]
49. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 83 (lat.), *John Comm.* XXXII, 13 [148] *Jer. Cat.* XXX to Jer. 27, 23 (LXX) [Greek Fragment: GCS IX 214, 28]
50. *John Comm.* XXXII, 24 [309]
51. *Ibid.* [301]
52. *John Comm.* XXXII, 13 [149-150]
53. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117 (lat.). The whole interesting passage of the *Commentary on Matth.* only exists in the late Latin version. Yet most of it has a parallel text either in *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 or in *Kata Kelsou* II, 11-12.
54. *K. K.* II, 11
55. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117 (lat.)
56. *Ibid.*
57. *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 [241]
58. *Ibid.* [244]
59. *K. K.* II, 11
60. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117. The Latin does not quite make sense for Christ was not resurrected by the time Judas spoke his words of penance. There would be a possibility that Judas, after the resurrection of the Christ, actually did penance once more, and that the original Greek text, for obvious reasons, has been obscured. This is not more than a hypothesis, however, and the context as well as the lack of any similar idea in the parallel text in the *Commentary on John* speak against it.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *John Comm.* XXXII, 19 [242]
63. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117
64. *John Comm. loc. cit.* [245]
65. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117
66. *John Comm. loc. cit.* [243]
67. *Matth. Comm. Ser.* 117
68. Cf. Footnote 60. No possible interpretation would ever be strong enough to

- devalue the original John Comm. XXXII, 19
69. *Matth. Comm. Ser. 117 and K.K. II*, 11
 70. Cf. the article by Chadwick: "Origen, Celsus and the resurrection of the body" in *Harvard Theological Review* XLI, 2 (1948)
 71. *John Comm. XXXII*, 14 [162] While the church fathers for centuries depended upon Origen in their views about Judas, Augustine, in this respect of the Judas problem, will be found in sharp contradiction to Origen: Jesus elected Judas because God wanted it, knowing well enough the *lupus ovina pelle contextus*" in him. Aug.: *Trac. Joh.* 55,4-5 & 112, 2.
 72. *Ibid.* [163]
 73. *Ibid.* [168]
 74. *John Comm. XXXII*, 18 [232]
 75. *Ibid.* [236]
 76. *Matth. Comm. Ser. 82*
 77. *John Comm. XXXII*, 6 [68]
 78. *John Comm. XXXII*, 13 [148]
 79. *Hom. in Jes. Nave XIII*, 2 (Ruf.) [VII 441, 3]
 80. *John Comm. XXXII*, 6 [68]
 81. *John Comm. XXXII*, 14 [161]
 82. *Cant. Cant. Comm. IV* (lat.) This Latin passage fits in consistently with what we know about Origen's conception of the free will (the third book of *Peri Archon*) and with the other passages dealing with the actual, free decision by Judas. A text by *Methodius* shows the same Origenistic line of thought: *qua propter recte egit Christus etiam cum esset verbum Dei non mutando mentem Judae, ne illum eligere bonum necessitate adigeret: De Resurrectione* III, 23 (12) [GCS p. 424]
 83. *Gen. Comm. III*, 6 Origen once discusses the question whether Jesus meant the very origin of incarnation, or the actual birth on this earth, by saying: it would have been better for him not to have been born. He prefers the second interpretation: *John Comm. XXXII*, 18 [239]
 84. *John Comm. XXXII*, 19 [250 sqq.]
 85. *Gen. Comm. III*, 6
 86. *John Comm. XXXII*, 18 [227]
 87. *Cant. Cant. Comm. IV* (loc. cit.)
 88. *John Comm. XXXII*, 13 [146]
 89. *John Comm. XXXII*, 24 [302]
 90. *Ibid.* XXXII, 23 [295-299]
 91. *John Comm. XXXII*, 18 [232] *Matth. Comm. Ser. 78* (lat.)
 92. *John Comm. XXXII*, 25 [320]
 93. *John Comm. XXXII*, 24 [302]
 94. *Ex. Hom. III*, 2 (Ruf.) [VI 163, 10]
 95. *John Comm. XXXII*, 24 [307]
 96. *Matth. Comm. Ser. 83* (lat.) *John Comm.* 13 [148] and the *Jer. Cat. XXX* in [GCS 214, 28]. In the *Acta Petri* (ca. 200 A.D.) Peter accuses the devil of having forced Judas into the betrayal. (Text in L. Vouaux, Paris 1922) Cf. also Ephraem Syr.: *Carmina Nis.* 35 (in *Kemptener Kirchenväter*, vol. 35).
 97. *John Comm. XXXII*, 2 [19]
 98. *Matth. Comm. XI*, 9
 99. *John Comm. XXXII*, 19 [246]
 100. The content of *Matth. Comm. Ser. 82* on a whole preserves this awareness quite well though I would not stress every single word of it in its actual form. Jesus was betrayed through, not by Judas (*per quem*, not *a quo*) and by the devil (*a quo*). And yet, woe to Judas and to anyone who betrays Christ! The picture about the judge who, as a servant of the devil, kills an innocent man does not solve the problem either. But at the end of the paragraph, it comes out clearly that Judas did his devilish service out of his free will. This is the ambiguity as shown in this text: the betrayal has been done by the devil (*a quo*) and through Judas (*per quem*), and yet, Judas did it of his own free will.
 101. *John Comm. XXXII*, 23 [295]
 102. *John Comm. XXXII*, 25 [320]
 103. *John Comm. XXXII*, 8 [84]
 104. *John Comm. XXXII*, 3 [25]
 105. *Matth. Comm. Ser. 75* (lat.), explaining *Matth.* 26, 2 Origen says further that the passive, impersonal construction "he will be delivered" is used, so it can be referred to all those who delivered him (or: betrayed him: the double meaning of *paradidomi*: to deliver, to betray, makes the combination with *Rom.* 8 possible!). Even if it were possible that the Augustinian idea of predestination which lay between the original and its translation could have influenced the Latin text, the main theme is undoubtedly Origenistic: the combination of *Matth.* 26,2 with *Rom.* 8,32.
 106. *Luke Fragment 26* (Greek) [GCS IX 245, 18-25]
 107. *John Comm. XXXII*, 21 [276]

THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION IN ESTONIA

KARL LAANTEE

The history of the Estonian nation begins about 2000 B.C. when they settled down in the land which is now known as Estonia. Roman historians called all the peoples of the Baltic area collectively by the name of "Aesti"; later that name came to apply to the Estonians alone. Tacitus thought that the "Aesti" spoke a language "similar to that of the Britons", whereas in fact the Estonians, Finns and Livs spoke a so-called Finno-Ugri language, utterly distinct from the languages of Slavs, Germanic groups, Latvians and Lithuanians.

In the period from A. D. 1208-1227 Estonia was conquered and "Christianized" by the newly established (A.D. 1202) military order "Fratres Militiae Christi," more popularly known as the "Order of the Brothers of the Sword." The methods which the crusaders employed were not such as to secure easy converts. A German priest wrote in his "Chronica Livoniae:"

"When we arrived there, we spread troops over all the roads, villages and districts of the country; we set on fire and destroyed everything, we killed all who were of masculine sex, captured women and children and took away much cattle and horses . . . and returned to Livonia with great rejoicing."

The Brothers held the sword and consequently they became the most powerful class in the land. They built castles and made the land safe for the bishops, priests and monks; now they claimed the right to rule the conquered territory. In 1237 the Order of the Brothers of the Sword was absorbed in the Order of Teutonic Knights, but the Livonian branch maintained considerable autonomy and the Master of the Knights was the most important man in the Land of Mary.¹

Gradually, when there was no outside enemy to be feared, the Order lost its compactness and the Brothers their original warrior strength. Constant quarrels with other classes had undermined the popularity of the Order, luxury had robbed it of its noblest qualities and laziness had changed the warriors into weaklings.

"Of the three monastic vows of the Order, the first—poverty—was never kept for an instant: the Knights had come to the Baltic to make their fortunes while serving God, and they settled down not as monks but as feudal landlords. The second—chastity—was soon forgotten: the Knights fornicated like soldiers and married like country gentlemen. . . . The third vow—obedience—was almost as grossly, though not so openly, disregarded. Being good feudalists, the Knights felt themselves obliged to acknowledge some suzerain; but they considered them-

selves at liberty to choose between the Master of the Order and the bishops, and to change their allegiance as convenience dictated."²

The Knights were intended to be the protectors of the Roman Catholic Church in the land, but now, when help was needed against the approaching Reformation, they were unable to offer it.

Almost equal in power to the Knights, was the Archbishop of Riga with his subject bishops of Tartu, Tallinn, Saare-Lääne and Courland. Most of the bishops possessed large territories, were ambitious for secular power and demanded the right to decide important matters in the diets. The quarrels of bishops and Knights often culminated in battles and bloodshed. Both parties sought help from Rome, but there the policy was, "divide et impera." No wonder that the Knights were reluctant to help bishops later in their struggle against the invasion of the new teaching of the Reformation.

The clergy in Estonia could be accused of the same sins as in other European countries. Archbishop Henning von Scharfenberg complained in 1428 that priests were not taking good care of parishes.³ These complaints were renewed in sharper forms at the Diet of Walk in 1442 and at the Diet of Wolmar in 1513. Worse than laziness was the immorality of the clergy. There was hardly a church council where priests were not rebuked for having concubines or indulging in drinking and gluttony. At the Diet of Wolmar (1513) the subject of concubinage was brought up again. The complaint was that the wives of the clergy were too proud and lived in the same luxury as the wives of the nobles. The aging Archbishop Jasper Linde declared himself helpless in the matter. He pointed out that already there were not enough priests in the land, and if any stricter demands were made, then those remaining would also leave the country. Moreover, he knew that even higher churchmen like cardinals had wives in other countries. The matter ended with an exhortation that the wives of the clergy should be humble and not use the same finery as the ladies of the nobility.⁴ Evidently the parish priests were quite glad to abandon celibacy and accept the more liberal teaching of Protestantism which helped them out of many difficulties.

Monasteries were never very popular in Estonia. In 1499 the City Council of Tallinn accused the near-by monasteries of sheltering thieves and murderers. Complaints grew constantly more frequent in the beginning of the sixteenth century that monks and friars were too greedy. Dominicans in Tallinn had a special skill at acquiring legacies⁵ and especially of laying hold of the wealth which had no master. Such estates of deceased persons should have belonged to the city, the citizens thought. When reformers made the misdeeds of the Catholic clergy and monks a matter of public discussion, there was no power to protect them.

The "third estate" was the rising power of the liberally minded cities. Tartu had about 6000 and Tallinn 4000 inhabitants, which was quite a number considering that the largest city on the Baltic Sea—Lübeck—had only about 10,000 inhabitants at the time.⁶ Tallinn and Tartu were both members of the Hanseatic League and important commercial centers. Foreign merchants mingled with local merchants, carrying the most important international news to Estonia. Thus a possibility of education was open to the cities which was not available to the rural areas. On the whole the merchant class was the most broadminded and progressive group in Estonia. On this liberal soil the first seed of the Reformation was sown.

The situation of the peasants was lamentable. They had not forgotten that Christianity was brought by fire and sword and had finally made them slaves. Frequent uprisings failed to restore their lost liberty. The Catholic Church was never dear to Estonians. The people held fast to their old faith. Though they were forbidden to worship the old deities openly, they did it secretly. The policy of the Church was short-sighted. For the sake of immediate advantage churches were built on the holy hills or some sacred grove. The old deities were identified with Catholic saints without much change of ideas. Church councils complained that sacrifices were brought openly to the god of thunder and to sacred trees and stones.⁷ As far as ethnic Estonians were concerned, then, they were ready to welcome the message from Wittenberg primarily for social and economic reasons. When the first message of the Reformation reached them which promised "Christian liberty,"⁸ they were certainly for it. Uprisings of peasants were so serious that the Knights turned against the Reformation, blaming the new faith rather than themselves.⁹

Estonia was a well prepared ground for the Reformation, but the seed had to be imported and sown before the fruit could appear.

In Livonia the name of Martin Luther was officially mentioned for the first time at the Prelates' Conference at Ronneburg on July 28, 1521.¹⁰ There were assembled Archbishop Jasper Linde; Johann Blankenfeld, Bishop of Tallinn and Tartu; Johann Kievel, Bishop of Saare-Lääne; and Basedorf, Bishop of Courland. One item in the agenda was "von der Sache des Doctors Martinus Luther."¹¹ The bishops decided that each one of them should gather the people of his diocese together to the cathedral church and inform them, either in person or through a representative, about the bull against Luther. This indicates that as early as 1521 the bishops saw some possibility of Luther's influence in the Baltic lands. The isolation was not as tight as one might think in these days of trains, automobiles and jet planes.

The first definite effect of Luther's teachings that we can prove, reached Estonia through Riga. Riga, as the capital of the Land of St. Mary, stood in close connection with the Estonian cities. There were mainly three channels through which Riga helped the cause of the Reformation in Estonia: 1) The union of the cities, formed in 1522 (for common protection of their interests), 2) correspondence between the reformers in Riga and Estonia, 3) visits of the reformers of Riga to Estonia.

The Reformation came to Riga in 1522 through Andreas Knopken 1490?-1539).¹² The reformer was born near Küstrin, and studied at Frankfort on Oder. His younger brother was a canon at St. Peter's in Riga and Andreas followed him there in 1517. Becoming discontented with his environment, he went to Treptow, in order to continue his studies. There he was working under the guidance of Bugenhagen when both became followers of Luther. Knopken returned to Riga in 1521. In the following year Knopken published his 24 theses and there was a disputation between him and certain monks which set the reformation movement rolling in Riga. He wrote letters to his friends of similar views in Tallinn encouraging the reformation in Estonia. Also his books and hymns found their way to Tallinn and Tartu.

Another reformer of Riga—Sylvester Tegetmeyer¹³—was also in close contact with Estonia. He was born in Hamburg and studied in Rostock and in Leipzig. After serving for two years as a chaplain in Rostock, he came to Riga in 1522. His methods were more radical than those of Knopken. His church—St. Jacob's—became the center of the overzealous party. Several riots occurred, and at least one outbreak of iconoclasm in the cathedral was led by Tegetmeyer himself. He was not satisfied until the monks and priests were sent out of the city.

Tegetmeyer's influence in Estonia was much greater than that of Knopken. Estonian nobles looked at him as the leader of the whole movement and attempted to kill him in 1525.¹⁴ Later he came to Tartu where he preached for four weeks, quieting the riotous crowds.

The Reformation in Estonia was greatly helped by Melchior Hofmann,¹⁵ a German Anabaptist and mystic and leather dresser by trade. This "Apostle of Livonia," as he came to be known, had an appeal to lower classes especially and rendered a great service to Estonia in spite of his extreme doctrines. When Hofmann's theology was questioned by his fellow-reformers, he went to Wittenberg where his views received full approval from Luther¹⁶ and Bugenhagen.

Martin Luther himself wrote several letters to "Den Auszerwelten lieben Freunden gottis, allen Christen zu Righe [Riga], Revell

[Tallinn], and Tarbthe [Tartu] ynn Liefeland [Livonia] . . ."¹⁷ We can hardly overestimate the encouragement and impetus which his letters brought to the daring few. It was a stimulating thought to be in direct contact with the great leader of the Reformation movement.

The hotbeds of the Reformation in Estonia were the cities, first of all Tallinn and Tartu. There was some reform preaching going on in Tallinn before Luther's teaching reached Estonia. When the news of the Reformation was heard from Riga, supported by Luther's letter (1523), the local reform-minded people felt at once kinship between the teaching of the German Reformer and their own discoveries. The local leaders accepted the news gladly, but at the same time their own advanced views were absorbed by the more developed ideas of Luther, and the two movements became one.

The outstanding person in the early years of the Reformation movement in Tallinn was Johann Lange. He was born in Germany, but the exact location of his birthplace is not known. From the city of Stade he came to Tallinn as a Premonstratensian monk.¹⁸ In 1523 Lange became chaplain of St. Nicolas Church in Tallinn. Since preaching was his chief duty, he had a good opportunity to win the people over to his views. He was anxious to lay bare the evils of the church and to call the people back to the simple faith and teaching of the New Testament.

Lange's message was shared by Zacharias Hasse and Hermann Marsow. The lives of both of these men are extremely obscure. As a preacher of the Reformation, Hasse had made such an impression on the people that in 1524 he was installed as a pastor of St. Olaf's Church. This was sanctioned by the city government in spite of the bitter opposition of St. Michael's Monastery, the patron of St. Olaf's.

Hermann Marsow was born in Riga. In 1523 he was registered as a student at Wittenberg University and a few months later we find him preaching in Tartu. In the next summer he was banished from the city by Bishop Blankenfeld and Marsow came to Tallinn.

These three men with others, whose names we do not know, were devoted to the new cause. Their outspoken sermons soon became a cause of bitter opposition. Monks especially could not tolerate any criticism of the Church. The reformers replied to the monks and friars by pointing out the evils of the monasteries. Friars on their part made wicked fun of the evangelical preachers.¹⁹ In the spring of 1524 the discord took more serious form. The municipal council proposed a debate between the reformers and friars, but the friars refused to accept it. Their excuse was that the Pope and their ordinances forbade them to dispute on doctrinal matters.²⁰ The city government now turned against the friars and forbade them to preach in the Estonian

language; in German they must preach only the simple teaching of the New Testament. The citizens demanded fewer holidays and the municipal council granted the request regardless of the opposition of the Catholic authorities.

The Catholic party of Tallinn sent a letter to Wolter von Plettenberg, Master of the Livonian Branch of the Teutonic Knights, accusing the city of heresy and of illegal treatment of the monastic orders. Plettenberg wrote a letter²¹ to the city government (March, 1524) in which he advised against preaching the Gospel in such a way that quarrels might arise; peasants should not be taught to rebel against their masters and due respect should be paid to the monks. The city was already determined to stand for the new doctrine. The municipal council replied to Plettenberg that no evil had been done, only some evils of the monks had been corrected.

The friars of St. Catherine's saw that their case was hopeless and started to carry out the treasures of the monastery. The city liked the valuables as much as the friars; and since the convent had less power, the city ordered an inventory of all the property of the monastery, forbidding them to remove anything. When in spite of this some things disappeared, the property of St. Catherine's was confiscated and the cellar was turned into a storehouse for munitions. The other rooms which were not necessarily used by the friars themselves, were reserved for the sick from the country. The friars were asked to save their souls by caring for the diseased. The most radical merchant organization, Schwartzhäupter, demanded back from the monasteries all their gifts which had been presented during the preceding 150 years.²²

Some Cistercian nuns of St. Michael, mostly relatives of the nobles, left the nunnery and married with the citizens. This displeased the vassals greatly. They had received no part of the confiscated wealth of St. Catherine's and now their relatives were permitted to leave the nunnery and marry with men of no noble rank. They demanded that all the married nuns should be sent back to the nunnery and that the men be excommunicated who had married them.

Plettenberg wrote another letter to the magistrates of Tallinn in 1524, asking that the treasures of the monasteries be given back, that no violence be used against the Catholics and that the nuns be sent back to the nunnery. This letter was read to the citizens of Tallinn. As a result of the dissatisfaction which it created, a riot broke out. The first object of the riot was the hated St. Catherine Monastery. From St. Catherine's the crowd proceeded to the Church of the Holy Spirit and then to St. Olaf's. Altars, icons and relics were destroyed, treasures were opened and many valuables were carried off. This was all done

in three hours by a mixed group of Germans and Estonians. Encouraged by the riot, the three reformers—Lange, Hasse and Marsow—presented to the city government a program of action in behalf of the Evangelical Church.²³ The plan, which was presented between the 15th and 19th of September in 1524, provided that Lange be appointed the superintendent of all churches in the city. No changes were to be made by other pastors without his consent. He was to appoint and discharge pastors with the approval of the municipal council. The services were to be held either in German or in the Estonian language. All the treasures taken from the Catholic churches were to be used for the poor. The treasury for the poor was to be supervised by a council of eight men, representatives of the municipal council and the major guilds. This act marked a definite victory for the Reformation. On January 12, 1525, monks and friars were given the choice of accepting the reformed faith or of departing from the city. They chose to leave. Now reformation was introduced into every department of life in Tallinn.

The second center of the Reformation in Estonia was Tartu. Herman Marsow is the first reformer of whom we have definite knowledge. He came to Tartu in the spring of 1524. His sermons were heard with the unanimous approval of St. Mary's congregation and public pressure was brought upon the municipal council that Marsow should be made a regular priest. The city government yielded to this demand though the right of the bishop had to be ignored. But the Bishop of Tartu, Johann Blankenfeld, was an able and strong opponent to the reformers. He succeeded in expelling Marsow from Tartu in July, 1524. In 1525 Blankenfeld became the successor of Archbishop Jasper Linde and later he sought help from the Pope and from Emperor Charles V against the Reformation; he travelled to Rome and Spain for this purpose, but died before he could return to Livonia.

In the autumn of 1524 Melchior Hofmann entered Tartu. He was an untrained lay preacher who by force of religious fervor, vehemence of speech, and directness of appeal, exercised a marvellous influence over the common people. He knew the Bible well and apocalyptic ideas were especially favored by him. The number of his followers grew rapidly. Blankenfeld decided to expel him as he did Marsow. Acting on the order of the Bishop, the bailiff of the castle made an attempt to arrest Hofmann when he was preaching to his followers on Sunday, January 7, 1525. The reformer was protected by the people. The unsuccessful attempt of the bailiff led to an iconoclastic uprising. A disorderly group invaded the Church of St. Mary where Catholic mass was in process. The priests and

choir were driven off and Hofmann was placed in the pulpit; images were taken down, carried to the market place and burnt. The same was done to the church of St. John. Mary Magdalene and St. James monasteries, with the nunnery of the Holy Spirit, suffered equally. A few days later a group of two hundred men gathered at the gate of the castle, and after a fight succeeded in entering it. Cannon were brought and directed against the citadel which sheltered the terrified clergy.

A complete break with the Catholics had occurred. No reconciliation was possible. The city government wrote a letter of explanation to the Master of the Livonian Order asking his help against Bishop Blankenfeld. At the same time it was understood that the religious situation was beyond Hofmann's ability for organization. Sylvester Tegetmeyer was called from Riga to quiet the stormy city. The Reformation in Tartu had to confront greater difficulties than in Tallinn. Bishop Blankenfeld's opposition, the banishment of Marsow, the radical teaching of Hofmann and the riots, all left their imprints on the constructive work. But finally, Tartu adopted a "Kirchenordnung" similar to that of Tallinn.

The Reformation had won the two largest cities in Estonia. From them the movement spread to the towns and villages. According to the pattern of Tallinn and Tartu, soon Narva, Rakvere, Viljandi and Uus-Pärnu were reformed. The nobility, who had the greatest influence on rural affairs, had no unified program either in favor of or against the Reformation. The exhortations of bishops were ignored and as for the Master of the Knights, Plettenberg, it is hard to decide whether he favored the Catholic or the reformed church; but it seems that his actions were motivated more by political expediency than by religious convictions. There are some allusions to preachers who taught the peasants of the Reformation. Plettenberg's letter of 1524 speaks of certain preachers who taught the Estonians to disobey their masters. In the same year the bailiff of Rakvere wrote to the Master of the Knights about certain men who taught the peasants that they need not work for the nobles nor pay taxes.²⁴ The peasants of the Harju-Viru region carried their interpretation of the Reformation teaching to practical conclusions. They demanded from their landlords the right to confirm or oppose the appointment of their pastors; that corporal punishment must cease, because it is not in harmony with Christian liberty; that the forest and water should be opened to free use, etc.²⁵ This shows that the Twelve Articles of the German peasants were known also in Estonia. One manuscript copy of the Twelve Articles has been discovered in the archives of Tallinn. But the unrest and uprisings of peasantry were suppressed

by the nobles, and the Reformation failed to fulfill the expectations of the Estonian peasants—redemption from social and economic oppression.

The Reformation in Estonia did not share in the theological disputes of Central Europe, because it was solely a Lutheran movement and it was not contested by other Protestant theologies, apart from the Hofmann interlude. In the initial period of the Reformation the anti-Catholic note was predominant in the sermons of the reformers, but gradually it gave way to more constructive emphasis on the essentials of the new faith, based on Luther's Small Catechism. Also, the first known printed book in the Estonian language belongs to this period. It was a Luther Small Catechism with parallel texts in Low German and Estonian, edited by S. Wanradt and J. Koell and published in 1535. This publication, however, contained too many errors and consequently the whole edition was destroyed by order of the municipal council of Tallinn. Another catechism was published in Estonian in 1554 by F. Witte, a clergyman of Tartu.

The victory of the Reformation in Estonia was officially recognized by the Diet of Wolmar in 1554. In the next year George Sieberg von Wischlingen signed the Peace of Augsburg on behalf of the Baltic provinces, which act may be interpreted as a sanction in international law of the Reformation in Estonia. The final development of the Reformation in Estonia was interrupted by political events. In 1558 the Russian Czar Ivan IV the Terrible invaded Estonia. His savage troops devastated the country, and initiated decades of war. The result was partition of Estonian territory between Sweden, Denmark, Poland and Russia. Fortunately, during the reign of Gustavus II Adolphus, Estonia was reunited under benevolent and enlightened Swedish rule. Gustavus Adolphus also erected a lasting monument to himself in Estonia by founding Tartu University in 1632. By the encouragement and help of the succeeding Protestant rulers of Sweden the Lutheran Church was firmly established in Estonia, and, I am convinced, it will outlive the present communist Babylonian Captivity.²⁸

1. The conquered lands—Estonia, Livonia, Latgallia, Kurland and Zemgallia—were dedicated to St. Mary in order to attract crusaders. The Grand Master's injunction to the Teutonic Knights was: "Dies Schwerdt empfang von meiner Hand
Zu schützen Gottes und Marien Land."
2. Jackson, J. Hampden, *Estonia*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., Second Edition, 1948, pp. 46-47.
3. Reiman, Villem, *Eesti a jalugu* [History of Estonia]. Tallinn: Kirjastus A. S. Varrak, 1920, p. 56.
4. Arbusow, Leonid, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Liv-, Est- und Kurland*. Leipzig: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, Vermittlungsverlag von M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1921, pp. 66-67.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 280.
6. Pohrt, Otto, *Reformationsgeschichte Livlands. Ein Überblick*. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger Eger & Sievers, 1928. (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, Jahrgang 46, Heft 2 /Nr. 145/), p. 7.
7. Reiman, p. 54.
8. The phrase was widely used by the peasants.
9. Bienemann, Friedrich Gustav, *Aus Livlands Luthertagen*. Tallinn (Reval): Franz Kluge, 1883, p. 75 ff.
10. Pohrt, p. 19.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Hoerschelmann, D. F., *Andreas Knopken, der Reformator Rigas*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhm), 1896, 257 p.
13. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Herausgegeben durch die Historische Commission bei der Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Bayern). Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker und Humboldt, Vol. 37, pp. 529-530.
14. Kruus, Hans, *Eesti ajaloo lugemik* (Textbook of Estonian History). Tartu: Eesti Kirjastuse Selts, 1924. pp. 156-158.
15. Linden, Friedrich Otto, *Melchior Hofmann, ein Prophet der Wiedertäufer*. Haarlem: De Erevan F. Bohn, 1885, 477 p.
16. According to Pohrt, p. 65, two years later, in 1527, Luther regretted his earlier judgment, writing in a letter: "... ich habe ernstliche Vorwürfe über mich ergehen lassen müssen wegen meiner Empfehlung, die ich jenem Mann (Hofmann) unbedachter Weise und von ihm getäuscht gegeben habe ..."
17. The first lines of salutation of Luther's first letter to Livonia in 1523.
18. Arbusow, pp. 279, 282.
19. A letter by the municipal council of Tallinn to Wolter von Plettenberg. Kruus, pp. 170-174.
20. Bienemann, p. 21.
21. Hansen, Gotthard, *Aus baltischer Vergangenheit. Miscellaneen aus dem Revaler Stadtarchiv*. Tallinn (Reval): Franz Kluge, 1894, pp. 123-125.
22. Kruus, pp. 171-174.
23. The reformers called themselves "evangelische prediger." The document of the "christlicher ordnancien" is printed in Bienemann's *op. cit.* pp. 65-68.
24. *Usupuhastus eestlaste maal* [Reformation in the land of Estonians]. Published by the Reformation Jubilee Commission. Tartu: Ed. Bergmann, 1924, p. 45.
25. Reiman, p. 61.
26. I wish to express my gratitude to Professor John T. McNeill who encouraged me to write this essay and made a number of valuable suggestions. Also I wish to thank Dr. Vieter Koresaar, an Estonian historian, for reading the manuscript.

AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM DURING THE REVOLUTIONARY EPOCH

SIDNEY E. MEAD, *University of Chicago*

It is commonly said that the two live movements in European and American Christianity during the eighteenth century were rationalism and pietism. Both were rooted in the seventeenth century. And commonly their differences, which were real, are stressed to the point of making them appear to have been completely separate and even mutually exclusive developments. This obscures the fact that in origin they were but obverse sides of a single movement which gathered enough power and momentum during the eighteenth century to sweep in religious freedom and separation of church and state over the opposition of the great bulk of traditional orthodoxy in the churches.

Only *after* this achievement of one of the two great organizational revolutions of Christendom¹ did pietism discover its latent incompatibility with rationalism, divorce itself and remarry traditional orthodoxy. American denominational Protestantism is the offspring of this second marriage living in the house of religious freedom built during the period of the first marriage. The child has always accepted and defended the house with ardor if not always with intelligence, but has generally exhibited great reluctance to admit that rationalists played a major part in building it.²

It is the purpose of this paper to examine some major developments during the Revolutionary Epoch which throw light upon this situation, and hence help us to understand some of the peculiar characteristics of the American religious scene.

1

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the hardening of a Protestant scholasticism which cramped the style of the learned, and a growing formalism in the churches which provided but dry food for the hungry souls of common people. Meanwhile Christendom was fragmented into absolutist rival faiths, and devastated by the religious wars between them.³ As a consequence there developed a sheer weariness with divisions, a repugnance toward wars of extermination, and a widespread positive desire for peace and unity. And underneath it all was the growing suspicion that formal theological and liturgical differences were probably not of ultimate importance, and perhaps not even important enough to fight over. Small wonder that in this situation "a small number of divines and laymen . . . tried to introduce 'sweet reasonableness' into theological discussion," while others thought they had found a way more excellent

than that provided by scholasticism "in the intuitive religion of the heart, and in the simplest and most primitive forms of faith, more or less independent of external ordinances and a 'form of words'."⁴ These two movements may thus be seen as "mutually supplementary."⁵

Rationalist and pietist were alike in that both, each in his own way, managed to shrug off the theological questions that had divided their most Christian fathers, and each suggested and sometimes practiced his own way of unity. The rationalist, as befitted the learned, found that "the essentials of every religion" could be reduced to a set of intellectual propositions regarding God, immortality, and the life of virtue. And, as Benjamin Franklin put it, these being "found in all the religions we had in our country, I respected them all." This, plus "the opinion that the worst had some good effects, induc'd me to avoid all discourse that might tend to lessen the good opinion another might have of his own religion."⁶ The pietist leader might be as learned in his generation as any rationalist, but his concern was for the hungry sheep in the Christian churches that might look up to but could not be nourished either on formal creeds and theologies or on intellectual propositions. All, however, could understand John Wesley's "heart strangely warmed" with "trust in Christ," and pietists found peace and a basis for unity in such personal religious experience. This they preached, spreading "scriptural religion throughout the land, among people of every denomination; leaving every one to hold his own opinions, and to follow his own mode of worship." So John Wesley could rhapsodize:

Methodists do not impose in order to their admission, any opinions whatever. Let them hold particular or general redemption, absolute or conditional decrees; let them be churchmen or dissenters, Presbyterians or Independents, it is no obstacle. Let them choose one mode of baptism or another, it is no bar to their admission. The Presbyterian may be a Presbyterian still; the Independent and Anabaptist use his own worship still. So may the Quaker and none will contend with him about it. They think and let think. One condition and only one is required—a real desire to save the soul. Where this is it is enough; they desire no more; they lay stress upon nothing else; they only ask, "Is thy heart herein as my heart? If it be, give me thy hand."⁷

Thus rationalists appealed to the head, and concluded that all the multifarious differences over which Christian churchmen fought were matters of non-essential opinion, as pietists appealed to the heart and concluded that the differences over which Christians had battled and bled for a millennium were immaterial between those of like "heart." But while in opposition to traditionalists in the churches rationalists and pietists supplemented one another by sharing a common sentiment of reaction, they nevertheless represented basically different paths of life. And both, each in its own way, when sep-

arated from traditionalism were in danger of setting men adrift by breaking the continuity of Christian history and scattering the content of Christian faith.

II

The situation in America during the eighteenth century was such as to minimize the differences between rationalists and pietists, and even to accentuate their positive agreements. In the first place the American colonial rationalists, although numerous, were not fomenters of religious controversy, being "willing to leave the question of divine revelation alone,"⁹ in a genial respect for the unenlightened. While Deistic thinking permeated the air the intellectual world breathed,¹⁰ mature Deists were apparently mild, urbane and outwardly conforming. The prime example is Philadelphia's suave and impeccable Franklin, who "regularly paid my annual subscription for the support of the only Presbyterian minister or meeting we had,"¹¹ who urged his daughter to "go constantly to church, whoever preaches,"¹² and who punctiliously, as new meeting houses were erected in Philadelphia, contributed his "mite for such purpose, whatever might be the sect."¹³ And Jefferson, while pressing the Act for Religious Freedom in Virginia in 1777, exhibited the same spirit by writing and sponsoring subscription lists for the support of the clergy who were to be cut off from state support.¹⁴

In the second place, beginning during the third decade of the century, and under the impetus given by both native and imported leaders, great revivals swept the colonies from New England to the Carolinas. Everywhere they brought controversy as staunch defenders of the old order, the traditionalists, rose to defend their churches against the disintegrating inroads of rampant "enthusiasm." Whether among Congregationalists in New England, or Presbyterians in the middle colonies, or Anglicans in the South, the substance of the controversy was the same—a clash between the revivalists and the "right-wing"¹⁵ supporters of the churchly patterns of clerical and ecclesiastical authoritarianism that had been transplanted from Europe.

The hold of these patterns had already been weakened by the inroads of transplanted "left-wing" sectarian groups which by this time were firmly entrenched in Rhode Island and the middle colonies and had gained a measure of tolerance in the other colonies. During the revivals the number of these groups was augmented by schisms from the "right-wing" churches (e.g. the Separate Congregationalists in New England), their membership was greatly increased, and they spread widely through all the colonies. This increase and expansion brought them into sharp conflict with the dominant or Established churches in every area.¹⁶ These churches, although harass-

ed and torn internally by the conflicts between revivalists and traditionalists, brought every possible ecclesiastical and civil weapon to bear against the sectarians and schismatics.¹⁷ Under this widespread persecution anti-clerical and anti-ecclesiastical sentiments of the "left-wing" sectarians were welded together in a vigorous positive thrust for complete religious freedom.

Meanwhile the rationalist permeation of the intellectual and cultured classes meant that many men in positions of social and political leadership were Deists. These men, however much they might abhor "enthusiasm" were appreciative of the practical moral application of the revivalists' gospel, especially since it was based upon an appeal to the teachings and simple religion of Jesus. Rationalist and sectarian-pietist were agreed that religion was a matter between the individual and his God without institutional mediation, and hence that the church was a voluntary organization of like-minded and like-hearted individuals. They were united in opposition to the tradition of clerical and ecclesiastical authoritarianism manifested in the "right-wing" churches,¹⁸ and they eschewed it with a denial of the binding power of the past. "As to tradition," wrote Jefferson in organizing his arguments against Episcopacy,

if we are Protestants we reject all tradition, and rely on the scriptures alone, for that is the essence and common principle of all Protestant churches.¹⁹

This was sentiment dear to the heart of any sectarian-pietist.

Small wonder, then, that the sympathies of the Deistic political leaders, as they observed the controversies in and between the "religious sects" that were caused by the revivals, were with the sectarian-pietists from the beginning, and that they became their spokesmen and defenders in the legislatures—as, for example, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson in Virginia.²⁰

Hence the struggles for religious freedom during the last quarter of the eighteenth century provided the kind of practical issue on which rationalists and sectarian-pietists could and did unite, in spite of underlying theological differences, in opposition to "right-wing" traditionalists. The positive thrust for the separation of church and state and the making of all religious groups equal before the civil law came from the sectarian-pietists both within and without the "right-wing" churches, and from the rationalistic social and political leaders. It was indeed

the leadership of such Lockian disciples as Jefferson and Madison, backed by an overwhelming left-wing Protestant public opinion, that was responsible for writing the clauses guaranteeing religious freedom into the new state constitutions and finally into the fundamental law of the land.²¹

This is an enlightening way of describing the complex alignment

of forces during the eighteenth century that accomplished the declaration for national religious freedom, and the realignment of forces during the Revolutionary Epoch which had such tremendous effects upon the later development of Protestantism in America. For the very success of their alliance during the eighteenth century in effecting religious freedom removed the primary bond that had held rationalist and sectarian-pietist together, and the conditions which then brought theological questions to the fore forced their split and a realignment of sectarian-pietist with traditionalist against rationalist.²²

III.

Thus far we have stressed the likenesses and agreements of rationalists and sectarian-pietists which made it possible for them to work together so long as the pressing issue was practical and political, as it was down to the final acceptance of religious freedom. But in order to understand the realignment that took place during the Revolutionary Epoch their differences must be noted.

First was the sociological difference. Rationalism was of the classes, the aristocracy of birth, breeding, and wealth, with its tradition of paternalistic social responsibility, of learning and concern for fundamental intellectual problems. Such men, although feeling themselves superior to the "enthusiastic" religion of the common man, were nevertheless apt to frown upon the dissemination of their own religious views among the masses because of the possibly bad effect on morals. Benjamin Franklin spoke for them in typical fashion in a letter believed to have been addressed to Thomas Paine:²³

think how great a portion of mankind consists of weak and ignorant men and women, and of inexperienced, inconsiderate youth of both sexes, who have need of the motives of religion to restrain them from vice, to support their virtue, and retain them in the practice of it till it becomes habitual, which is the great point for its security.²⁴

And Herbert M. Morais concluded that much of the later "vilification of Paine was due to the fact that he was guilty of carrying heresy to the people" and hence was a traitor to his class.²⁵

It is obvious that any position which felt itself secure only within an aristocratic setting had a very questionable future in store for itself during a period when the outstanding trend was toward the equalitarianism that flowered in the age of President Jackson and the common man. Jefferson's democratic party lost its aristocratic leadership by the time of Jackson, and apparently had even lost Jefferson's concept of a responsible "natural aristocracy" grounded on "virtue and talents."²⁶ In brief, during this time the ethos that had sheltered Deism during the eighteenth century disintegrated, and Deistic thinking

carried to the people in the popularized version of Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason* was soon found wanting.

Second, and more important, was the familiar theological difference, expressed as the necessity for a special and particular revelation in the Scriptures versus the complete sufficiency of human reason. During the eighteenth century in America conservative rational Christians—clergymen like “Gay, Briant and Bentley in Congregational surroundings and Johnson and Smith in Anglican circles” commonly “held that the authoritative basis of natural religion did not rest in reason alone but also depended upon the Christian revelation,”²⁷ and even those more radical in their views did not press the point publicly. Thus Benjamin Franklin, just a month before he died in 1790, when asked directly by Ezra Stiles the test question about his belief in the divinity of Jesus, replied charmingly in a way completely to avoid the issue,

I have, with most of the Dissenters in England, some Doubts as to his Divinity; tho' it is a question I do not dogmatize upon, having never studied it, and think it needless to busy myself with it now, when I expect soon an Opportunity of knowing the truth with less trouble.

However, he added with disarming candor,

I see no harm . . . in its being believed, if that Belief has the good consequence, as probably it has, of making his Doctrines more respected and better observed; especially as I do not perceive, that the Supreme takes it amiss, by distinguishing the Unbelievers in his Government of the world with any peculiar Marks of his Displeasure.²⁸

Even an ardent champion of orthodoxy would have to have time on his hands in order to pick a quarrel with such a genial wit who contributed regularly to one church and gave his “mite” to all.

But looking back on the period we can see that once the practical political goal of religious freedom was achieved it would require only a situation that would accentuate the central theological difference between rationalists on the one hand and sectarian-pietists and traditionalists on the other to bring the groups into open conflict. Even so, it was only when rationalistic religious thinking assumed real or imagined social and political implications in America that controversy resulted. This happened when an interpretation of the French Revolution led to the conclusion that there was a direct cause-and-effect relationship between “infidel” thinking and the later phases of the revolution; and when during the rise of the Jeffersonian party the religious views of Jefferson and other leaders of the party could be labeled “French” with enough popular plausibility to make the label stick.

The rise of the Jeffersonian party in America coincided with the events of the French revolution. America was still oriented to Europe and the struggles in the Old World were reflected in the New. Hence

from the beginning of the definition of differences within the first Cabinet of the new government, symbolized by the names of Hamilton and Jefferson, the former reflected sympathies with England, the latter with France—at least, and this was sufficient, so it was widely supposed.²⁹

Jefferson and his cohorts were not, of course, theologians or religious leaders. They were political reformers with typical eighteenth century theories about the nature of man and hence about the social and political institutions most suited to him as a rational being. Basic was the notion that man's present deplorable situation was largely due to the enslavement of his natural reason in the interests of selfish and privileged individuals and groups in the society. Jefferson merely echoed the opinion of his group when he said,

My opinion is that there would never have been an infidel, if there had never been a priest. The artificial structure they have built on the purest of all moral systems, for the purpose of deriving from it pence and power, revolt those who think for themselves, and who read in that system only what is really there.³⁰

Hence they concluded that reform depended upon the freeing of man's natural reason from such enslavement—largely by opening all the channels of communication through freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to assemble and petition, so that every opinion could have a hearing, errors ceasing "to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."³¹ This is the theory that lies back of the great reforming zeal and thrust developed during the eighteenth century.

This reforming thrust found directly across its path in France, to which all eyes were directed, the twin institutions of monarchy and church. And of the two the church came to be regarded as the more culpable because it seemed to the reformers that it was the church that really operated the machinery for the enslavement of the minds of the people. The principles of Jesus, said Jefferson, "were departed from by those who professed to be his special servants, and perverted into an engine for enslaving mankind, and aggrandizing their oppressors in church and state." These men, he continued, warped "the purest system of morals ever before preached to man . . . into a mere contrivance to filch wealth and power to themselves."³² Thomas Paine, a more excellent or less cautious pamphleteer, put it more briefly and bluntly:

All national institutions of churches, whether Jewish, Christian or Turkish, appear to me no other than human inventions, set up to terrify and enslave mankind, and monopolize power and profit.³³

Hence the church came under attack as the first institution that must be broken in the interests of freedom and reform. And there

were two obvious ways of undermining the control of the church over the minds of the people.

The first was to attack the existing churches as institutions reared not upon the "pure religion of Jesus" but upon the historical corruptions of that pure religion. The prime example of this sort of attack is Joseph Priestley's two volume *History of the Corruption of Christianity*, first published in 1782. Priestley conceived the work as "researches into the origin and progress" of the corruptions of Christianity, in such manner as will tend to give all the friends of pure Christianity the fullest satisfaction that they reflect no discredit on the revelation itself."³⁴ In the interests of the true Christian faith, he thought, it was necessary "to exhibit a view of the dreadful corruptions which have debased its spirit, and almost annihilated all the happy effects which it was eminently calculated to produce."³⁵

This attack on the existing churches, even though launched by a rationalistic Unitarian, was in essence the same kind of attack that was dear to the hearts of anti-clerical and anti-ecclesiastical sectarian-pietists, and hence it found a wide appeal in America. And even in more extreme form it did not push the crucial issue regarding revelation versus reason to the front.

Among the political leaders this was, as intimated in the quotations above, the view of Thomas Jefferson, who is said to have read Priestley's work through once a year from the time of its publication, and to have recommended it as required reading for students in the University of Virginia as the work most likely to wean them from sectarian narrowness. His own attempt while president, and later, to distill from the four gospels "The Philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth . . . for the use of the Indians, unembarrassed with matters of fact or faith beyond the level of their comprehension" was his positive contribution in the form of a definition of the "pure religion of Jesus." "We must," he said, "reduce our volume to the simple Evangelists: select, even from them, the very words of Jesus." This, he added, he had performed for his own use

by cutting verse by verse out of the printed book, and arranging the matter which is evidently his and which is as easily distinguished as diamonds in a dunghill.

These diamonds mined out of the dunghill constituted

the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man . . . forty-six pages of pure and unsophisticated doctrines such as were professed and acted upon by the unlettered Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, and the Christians of the first century.³⁶

Sectarian pietists could have little quarrel with this.

But this attack on the church, depending as it did upon the ability to keep in mind the distinction between the pure religion of

Jesus and the religion of the existing churches, was too subtle for use during the excitements of social and political upheaval. Hence the more radical attack—always latent in deistic thinking³⁷—namely, the direct attack on the orthodox Christian view of revelation itself, on the basis that the church held its great power over the minds of the people because it claimed to be the sole guardian and interpreter of God's saving revelation to man. The notable popularized version of this kind of attack is Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*. Said Paine,

Every national church or religion has established itself by pretending some special mission from God communicated to certain individuals. The Jews have their Moses; the Christians their Jesus Christ, their apostles and saints; and the Turks their Mahomet, as if the way to God was not open to every man alike.³⁸

The motivating thought in the mind of the author here is clear—if the people's belief in the idea of revelation as held by the orthodox could be completely undermined, the whole structure of the church would collapse,³⁹ and the way be cleared for the true religion founded upon the true revelation of God in "CREATION." For, since

all corruptions . . . have been produced by admitting of what is called *revealed religion*, the most effective means to prevent all such evils and impositions is not to admit of any other revelation than that which is manifested in the book of creation, and to contemplate the creation as the only true and real word of God that ever did or ever will exist; and that everything else, called the word of God, is fable and imposition.⁴⁰

Here, then, the real theological issue was raised and the direct claims of "natural" as over against "revealed" religion were laid bare. But as the exponents of natural religion had become so explicit in their claims only when goaded into doing so through the pressures to promote their reforms, the theological issue was inextricably bound up with the social and political issues and all but lost to sight.⁴¹

What could be clearly enough sensed by religious leaders of all groups, even by the most heart-happy pietists, was that this attack undermined not only the traditionally authoritarian churches, Catholic and Protestant, but Christianity itself as they conceived it. And this prospect could be made alarming not only to leaders in the several churches, including sectarian pietists, but also to many intellectuals who, while nominally, at least, Deists themselves, deplored the undermining of the people's simple faith.

At this juncture of events, as befitted the new republic, the battle became one for the allegiance of the masses of the people. Works like Ethan Allen's *Reason the Only Oracle of Man* (1784), and Paine's *Age of Reason* (1794) carried the issues to the people through popularization. And defenders of orthodox Christianity—men like Timothy Dwight and (later) Lyman Beecher in Connecticut—followed

suit, as, being experienced revivalists, they were eminently prepared to do. Such heated discussion conducted in the vernacular did not admit of subtle distinctions. Hence the tendency on both sides greatly to oversimplify the issues. It is necessary to keep this in mind in order to understand the ensuing conflict. It cannot be understood simply as an intellectual controversy, but is better regarded as all-out ideological warfare.

The striking revolutionary developments of the period provide the context. The European political situation loaned itself to the interpretation that an Infidel International was deliberately fostering the overthrow of all religion and all government—that it had been successful in France and was pushing out from there. Jedediah Morse of the First Church in Charlestown, Massachusetts, became an outstanding spokesman for this view in his Fast Day sermon preached in Boston on May 9, 1789. He took his cue from a work published by Professor John Robinson of the University of Edinburgh in 1798, the title of which is sufficiently explanatory of the contests:

Proofs of a Conspiracy against all Religion and Governments of Europe carried on in Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies.⁴²

Morse claimed that branches of the Order were already established in America, suggested that Paine's *Age of Reason* was one of their products, and held that the Democratic Societies were spending the principles of illuminism through the land.

This simplified interpretation of the situation in America, although vehemently and soundly disputed by some, was of a nature to become widely accepted. It was picked up and broadly echoed through sermons and speeches until, as Vernon Stauffer concluded, "there was probably not a solitary Federalist leader in the United States who did not believe that French ministers and agents were in secret league with influential representatives of the Democratic party."⁴³

Meanwhile the Federalists who, understandably enough, identified their continued well being and control of the government with the continued well being of the new nation, had in effect declared "war upon the ideas of the French Revolution" in the Sedition Act of 1798.⁴⁴ Such men easily recognized in the party led by Thomas Jefferson the American instrument of the Infidel International. Jefferson was known to have consorted with French Infidels during his five years in France, and although seemingly always cautious of his public pronouncements on religion, enough was known of his Deistic views to give popular plausibility to the notion that he was a thoroughgoing Infidel with diabolical designs on American institutions.⁴⁵ This view of Jefferson and his party seemed to be confirmed by the

concurrent organization of radical Deistic Societies in several American cities, the publication and circulation of several outspoken Deistic papers, and the attempt on the part of Deistic speakers—notably for example the renegade Baptist preacher, Elihu Palmer—to work up a definitely anti-Christian, or, rather, anti-church crusade among the people.⁴⁶

It was in New England that the controversy became hottest, and the most effective anti-infidel party line was developed by colorful and able leaders.

There the Congregational churches were established, and their clergy Federalist almost to a man and inclined to identify true religion with the Standing Order. Hence they soon constituted the chief bloc of opposition to the rising Jeffersonian party. Naturally that party in its thrust for power attacked this "political Congregationalism" which stood in its way, and seemed to bear out the reformer's notion that the church was the primary support of conservative and reactionary government. Hence disestablishment became one of its main objectives. This development served further to confuse the theological and political issues, for disestablishment early gained the support of the "sects" who suffered some restrictions and more humiliations under the Establishment, and threw them into the party of the "infidels" politically, while theologically they belonged with the clergy of the Establishment. Disestablishment also gained significant support from the unchurched who were apt to resent having to pay taxes for the support of the Congregational churches.

This is why Lyman Beecher, outstanding defender of the Congregational order at the time, could say that "democracy as it rose, included nearly all the minor sects, besides the Sabbath breakers, rum-selling, tippling folk, infidels, and ruff-scuff generally."⁴⁷ To Beecher at the time it apparently seemed clear enough that if this Sabbath-breaking, rum-selling, tippling ruff-scuff could be reformed into temperate Congregationalist observers of the Sabbath they would automatically cease to be democrats and a threat to the Standing Order. Thus "infidelity" would be overthrown and true religion, good morals and sound government continue to prevail.⁴⁸

So long as the issue was the practical one of religious freedom the sectarian-pietists thus aligned themselves with the rationalists against the traditionalists. And true to form, when disestablishment finally came in Connecticut the realignment of sectarian-pietist with traditionalist against rationalist immediately took place. Then even Beecher saw that political defense of the Standing Order caused a false alignment of religious forces. For he noted that by the repeal of the law compelling everyone to pay toward the support of some

church, "the occasion of animosity between us and the minor sects was removed and the infidels could no more make capital with them against us." Then indeed, those of the minor sects "began themselves to feel the dangers of infidelity, and to react against it, and this laid the basis of cooperation and union of spirit."⁴⁹

Here is a microcosm of what happened in America generally once the political issue of religious freedom was acceptably settled. Then the sectarian-pietist lamb snuggled up against the lion of traditionalism for protection against the infidel wolves. But there the metaphor breaks down, for the "lion" and the "lamb" produced offspring—the American Protestant denominations.

It is important to note that the theological issue which formed the basis of this union of traditionalist and sectarian-pietist in America, and constituted their real difference with the Deists, was all but lost sight of in the excitement of the controversy. Rather the effective argument against "infidelity" was moral and political, not theological—the argument namely, that "infidel" thinking directly and necessarily led to personal immorality and chaos in society. This has been labeled the "argument from tendency"—a viewing with alarm that was very effective in gaining popular support, but which meant that the issue between natural and revealed religion was never really discussed on a theological level at all.

IV

Out of this kind of attack on infidelity, plus organized efforts to carry the appeal to as many people as possible, the new revivalism was born. The vivid presentation of the two alternatives, Christianity and Infidelity, with the simplified version of the moral, social, and political tendencies of each, and the fervid insistence that the individual could and must choose between them, was its substance. And men like Timothy Dwight had a way of making what he called "Infidelity" as vivid and repulsive for his generation as Jonathan Edwards at Enfield had made hell fire for a previous generation.

The substance of the new revivalism, although clothed in less learning on the frontier than in New England, was the same the country over, and the story of how Infidelity was drowned in the great tidal wave of revivalism that swept the country early in the nineteenth century has been made familiar enough.⁵⁰

This welter of controversy and revivalism eventuated in a realignment of forces and movements that was to condition the development of Protestantism in America for more than a century, and to stamp it with characteristics that almost baffle analysis. But all are related to the fact that pietism came to dominate overwhelmingly in all the denominations.

Once religious freedom had been won, these denominations were confronted by the great problem posed by a rapidly growing and westward moving population about ninety per-cent of which was unchurched. Revivalism, developed during the Colonial period, proved the most effective technique, and was adopted by all the denominations. It was revivalism, stressing "evangelism more than creed"⁵¹ that "terminated the Puritan and inaugurated the Pietist or Methodist age of American church history."⁵²

And pietism, or "Methodism," for reasons suggested above, was peculiarly amorphous and intellectually uncritical.⁵³ The pietist was not inclined to make logical consistency a test of either doctrine or fellowship, and in every period was not likely to permit basic theoretical differences to stand in the way of cooperation with those who seemed to be of like heart in working for "good" social and political ends. And he was likely to equate, as the Methodists put it, "spreading scriptural holiness over these lands" with reforming the nation, assuming that "if the man's soul was saved fundamental social change would inevitably follow."⁵⁴ Hence pietists have been apt to endorse any current reform movement that seemed likely to accomplish "good" ends, and as apt to defend any social order that gave free range to evangelism.

Pietists acted in this fashion during the eighteenth century when working with rationalists for religious freedom. In the revolutionary period they vehemently rejected the rationalists' religious position, but retained much of their social and political views. Hence while sectarian-pietists aligned themselves with traditional orthodoxy theologically, they by and large clung to the rationalists' social and political program,⁵⁵ for which there was little theoretical foundation in the orthodoxy they now professed.

It is this underlying schizophrenia of nineteenth century pietistic American Protestantism that makes its activities so difficult to understand.⁵⁶ Recognition of it, for example, throws light upon F. O. Matthiessen's observation that the many reform movements of the eighteen forties "marked the last struggle of the liberal spirit of the eighteenth century in conflict with the rising forces of exploitation."⁵⁷ This seems implausible at first glance because so many of the reformers were evangelical Protestant Christians. But it is less implausible when the conflict is seen as one taking place in the jelly-like intellectual structure of pietistic reformers themselves.

So far as the bulk of American Protestantism was concerned the "struggle" eventuated in a victory for "the rising forces of exploitation." These forces provided the apologetic ideology for their "acquisitive society" delineated by Ralph Gabriel in his discussion of

"The Gospel of Wealth of the Gilded Age."⁵⁸ And pietistic religious leaders accepted and sanctioned this ideology as easily as their predecessors had aligned themselves with rationalists in the eighteenth century and with the traditionally orthodox early in the nineteenth.

Meanwhile, insofar as the defenders of traditional orthodoxy concerned themselves with such matters, they were solidly conservative. All of which offers substantiation for the view that "at least from the time of the battle with the Enlightenment, religious social doctrine [in America] offered a powerful and uncompromising support to the status quo."⁵⁹ So it was then when critics of the social and economic order began to emerge in the denominations they soon discovered, like Walter Rauschenbush, that if they were to embark upon *Christianizing the Social Order* they must first create or reconstruct *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. But at the time adequate materials for such a theology were not obviously present.

If on the one hand, the roots of the religious and social activities of the American Protestant denominations were thus made ambiguous during the revolutionary period, on the other hand their intellectual life was rendered fuzzy and inconsistent.

For although there was at the time a theological issue important enough to divide honest and able men, the nature of the controversy was such that it was not discussed or settled on its own merits. Timothy Dwight's eminent men who were finally persuaded and began to insist that Christianity "was absolutely necessary to good Government, liberty and safety" were not necessarily convinced because they were persuaded that revealed religion was true and natural religion was false. There is considerable evidence to indicate that they may have been convinced only that it was more expedient. An English traveler in America in 1822-1823 observed that

Instances of openly avowed deism are rare. Persons who hold deistical opinions generally either keep them to themselves, or veil them under the garb of flimsy hypocrisy . . . In many parts a man's reputation would be seriously injured if he were to avow himself one.⁶⁰

This testimony could be multiplied many times, and it suggests that "Infidels" were not so much convinced as driven underground.⁶¹ Protestantism thus laid on the table a large item of unfinished intellectual business.

Further, the effectiveness of the argument from tendency depended upon slurring over many important distinctions and tilting the whole scale of values so that everything that could be dubbed "infidelity" was put on an incline and viewed with alarm as irresistibly sliding toward atheism, immorality, and chaos. This meant that intellectual issues were transformed into moral issues, and intellectual challenges were not met as such. Pietists were inclined to make the

moral character of the speaker the test of the truth of what was said, and the absence of petty individualistic vices the test of moral character. Thus American Protestantism largely fell into the murky habit of seldom meeting or solving basic intellectual problems (as distinct from technical problems), substituting for this irksome task the criticism of the moral character of those who raised them. It is notable that almost every subsequent religious and social critic in America has been called immoral or atheistic at one time or in one way or another, and many cogent criticisms thus easily met.

But the great item of unfinished intellectual business confronting the Protestant denominations was and is the problem of religious freedom. And here the situation is almost desperate as increasingly it becomes clear that the problem cannot be solved simply by maligning the character of those who question the American practice.

Is it not passing strange that American Protestantism has never developed any sound theoretical justification of or theological orientation for its most distinctive practice? In 1953 we should probably have to agree with the writer of 1876 who said that

we seem to have made no advance whatever in harmonizing (on a theoretical level) the relations of religious sects among themselves, or in defining their common relation to the Civil power.⁶²

The reasons for this lacuna have been suggested in this paper. There is no getting around the fact that the fundamental documents of American religious freedom are James Madison's *Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man* of 1784, and Thomas Jefferson's *An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom*, which was written in 1779 and enacted in Virginia in 1786.⁶³ Both of these documents are oriented in a theological rationalism. Hence when Protestantism vigorously rejected eighteenth century rationalism during the revolutionary period, it cut itself off from the theoretical justification for the religious freedom it ardently espoused in practice. And it has never been made clear that the practice can be given theoretical justification on the premises of traditional orthodoxy which the bulk of the denominations have professed to accept. Hence at present the strange inclination of Protestant guardians of separation of church and state against real or imagined Roman Catholic "threats" to accept as their own the purely "secular" defenses being promulgated, and in a way that implies the equation of Protestantism with secularism. There seems to be too little realization that identification with secular defenses of this "good" cause could be as disastrous for Protestantism as for Roman Catholicism.⁶⁴

Again we are confronted with an underlying schizophrenia. It puzzled Ralph Gabriel who noted correctly enough that although

during the Middle Period, the secular faith in democracy and the religious faith of evangelicalism were not only closely interrelated but were mutually interdependent . . . [and] complemented one another,⁶⁵

yet they were never really merged and given over-all meaning in an inclusive intellectual structure. It is suggested here that this did not take place because, although their theoretical foundations were unreconciled and perhaps unreconcilable, yet the nature of the predominant pietistic Protestantism was such that "mere" theoretical considerations did not trouble its leaders even though they constituted the foundations of their religious and civil house.

In conclusion, the alignment of traditionalism and sectarian-pietism against rationalism during the revolutionary period gained a tremendous victory for Christianity in the popular arena, and placed the marks of its peculiar strengths and weaknesses on all subsequent American Protestantism. Its strengths produced "The Great Century [1814-1914]" celebrated by Professor K. S. Latourette in his massive *History of the Expansion of Christianity*. Its weakness effectively scuttled most of the intellectual structure of Protestantism. When the tremendous growth and innumerable good works of American Protestantism are celebrated, it must also be noted that "no theologian or theology of first rank issued from the nineteenth century Christianity of the United States."⁶⁶

The lush century of expansion and growth in the midst of apparently unlimited resources produced an American Protestant dinosaur, huge and impressive, but now, its pietistic heart's blood changing rapidly into routine moralism, it is in danger of perishing from a lack of intellectual power.

1. "On the administrative side, the two most profound revolutions which have occurred in the entire history of the church have been these: first, the change of the church, in the fourth century, from a voluntary society . . . to a society conceived as necessarily co-extensive with the civil community and endowed with the power to enforce the adherence of all members of the civil community; second, the reversal of this change . . . in America." W. E. Garrison, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLVI (1948), 17.
2. Robert Baird, *Religion in America*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845), 110-111. Baird argued that religious freedom in Virginia was "mainly owing to the exertions of the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers" while Jefferson contributed his "famous act" not because he thought "the great principles embodied in the measure

were right" but because "it seemed to degrade Christianity." This, he added, is what "made the arch-infidel chuckle with satisfaction."

3. See Roland H. Bainton, "The Struggle for Religious Liberty," *Church History*, X (June 1941), 97.
4. M. Kaufman, "Latitudinarianism and Pietism," *Cambridge Modern History* (New York, 1908), V, 742.
5. *Ibid.*, 763.
6. Frank L. Mott & Chester E. Jorgenson, *Benjamin Franklin. American Writers Series* (New York, 1936), 70.
7. John Wesley, *Sermons on Several Occasions* (New York, 1851), I, 392.
8. Quoted in William W. Sweet, *The American Churches, An Interpretation* (Nashville, 1948), 46-47.
9. Herbert M. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America* (New York, 1934), 13.
10. Note for example how easily the youthful Franklin, brought up "piously in the Dissenting way . . . soon became a

- thorough Deist" simply by reading orthodox refutations of Deism, Mott and Jorgenson, *Benjamin Franklin*, p. 55.
11. *Ibid.*, 12.
 12. Letter to Sarah Franklin, Nov. 8, 1764, in Nathan G. Goodman (ed.), *A Benjamin Franklin Reader* (New York, 1945), 237.
 13. Mott and Jorgenson, *Benjamin Franklin*, 70.
 14. Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson, Apostle of Americanism* (Boston, 1944), 103-104.
 15. The phrases "right wing" and "left wing" of the Reformation have come into quite general use since the publication of the article by Roland H. Bainton, "The Left Wing of the Reformation," in the *Journal of Religion*, XXI (April 1941), 124-134. According to Bainton's definition "The left wing is composed of those who separated church and state and rejected the civil arm in matters of religion." These, he adds, were "commonly on the left also with regard to church organization, sacraments, and creeds." A more radical social definition of the two "wings" was coming into use before publication of Bainton's article—see e.g., Ernest S. Bates, *American Faith* (New York, 1940), chapters 2 and 3.
 16. Note for example the "New Lights", Separate Congregationalists, and Baptists in New England, the "New Side" Presbyterians in the Middle Colonies, and the Presbyterians and Baptists in the Anglican South.
 17. See for example Connecticut's "Act for Regulating Abuses and Correcting Disorders in Ecclesiastical Affairs" of 1742, and the struggle for recognition of dissenters' rights under the English Toleration Act in Virginia.
 18. Compare with W. W. Sweet's "comparison . . . between the basic ideas of the popular religious bodies and those held by the intellectual liberals" in "Natural Religion and Religious Liberty in America," *Journal of Religion*, XXV (Jan. 1945), 54-55.
 19. Saul K. Padover (ed.), *The Complete Jefferson* (New York, 1943), 940.
 20. It is said that Madison and Jefferson were intrigued by the practice of democracy in the Baptist churches and no doubt their interest in religious freedom was stimulated by their observation of the persecution of the Baptists in Virginia.
 21. William W. Sweet, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLVI (Mar. 1948), 45. The argument is more fully developed in the article noted above, note 18.
 22. Compare the position of John M. Meeklin in *The Story of American Dissent* (New York, 1934), 36: "It was the pressure of circumstances that brought the leaders of the dissenting sects into sympathetic contacts with Paine and Jefferson at the end of the eighteenth century. When the battle for religious and national liberty was finally won and the great principle of separation of church and state safely embodied in the Constitution, Paine and Jefferson speedily lost their attraction for the dissenting sects."
 23. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 20.
 24. Thomas C. Hall, *The Religious Background of American Culture* (Boston, 1930), 172.
 25. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 121.
 26. See Jefferson's letter to John Adams, October 28, 1813, in Stuart G. Brown (ed.), *We Hold These Truths* (New York, 1941), 114.
 27. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 15.
 28. Mott and Jorgenson, *Benjamin Franklin*, 508-509.
 29. See John C. Miller, *Crisis in Freedom; the Alien and Sedition Acts* (Boston, 1951), *passim*. E.g., p. 11, Miller notes that Hamilton regarded the Republicans from Jefferson on down as "Frenchmen in all their feelings and wishes." See also Charles D. Hazen, *Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution* (Baltimore, 1897), 140.
 30. Letter to Mrs. M. Harrison Smith, August 6, 1816, quoted in W. W. Sweet, *Journal of Religion*, XXV (Jan. 1945), 52-53.
 31. Jefferson's "An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom," in Padover, *The Complete Jefferson*, p. 947. Jefferson argued consistently that where "reason and experiment have been indulged . . . error has fled before them. It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself." (*Ibid.*, 675). In his Second Inaugural he pointed out the salutary effects of such freedom (*Ibid.*, 413).
 32. Quoted in Adrienne Koch, *The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson* (New York, 1943), 26.
 33. Quoted from *The Age of Reason*, in Arthur W. Peach (ed.), *Selections from the Works of Thomas Paine* (New York, 1928), 232.
 34. Joseph Priestley, *An History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (2d ed., Birmingham, 1793), I, v.
 35. *Ibid.*, xv.
 36. See Henry Wilder Foote, *Thomas Jefferson; champion of religious freedom, advocate of Christian morals* (Boston, 1947), 51-52.
 37. "Always latent" because to the deistic way of thinking the orthodox view of revelation was particularistic—that is, given to a particular group at a par-

- tiacular time and place and hence not readily available for all mankind. See Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, 1936), 288-289, 292, for a discussion of this aspect of rationalism. Compare Paine, *Age of Reason*, in Peach, *Selections*, 250-51.
38. In Peach, *Selections*, 232. *The Age of Reason* was written in France and as much to stem the trend toward atheism as to undermine the church, "lest in the general wreck of superstition, of false systems of government and false theology, we lose sight of morality, of humanity, and of the theology that is true." Although widely read in America, it seems always to have been somewhat alien to the real situation there. The incongruity was noted by Lyman Beecher, who was amazed that "Boys that dressed flax in the barn, as I used to read Tom Paine and believed him," and that the rural youths in Yale College "called each other Voltaire, Rousseau, D'Alembert, etc., etc." after the denizens of the sophisticated French world. Charles Beecher (ed.), *Autobiography, Correspondence, etc., of Lyman Beecher* (New York, 1864), I, 43.
 39. Compare Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 129: "the deism of Paine, Volney and Palmer, presented in a popular form, was designed to reach the masses in order to destroy their faith in traditional Christianity with its priesthood, dogmas and supernatural revelation. Its ultimate end was to replace the Christian religion by the religion of nature with its three-fold creed—God, Virtue and Immortality, a creed believed in even by devout Christians.
 40. In Peach, *Selections*, 250, 263 note.
 41. The theological issues raised by Paine's *Age of Reason* apparently received only a very few replies on a "rational and scholarly plane." Most of the "replies" were primarily personal attacks on Paine. See Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 163-67.
 42. See Vernon Stauffer, *New England and the Bavarian Illuminati* (New York, 1918), 229 ff; Jones, *America and French Culture*, 398-99.
 43. Stauffer, N. E. and the *Bavarian Illuminati*, 126-27; 272 ff.
 44. Miller, *Crisis in Freedom*, 74.
 45. Jones, *America and French Culture*, 402-403.
 46. This ground has been made familiar by the studies of Vernon Stauffer, Charles Hazen, Herbert M. Morais, G. Adolf Koch and Howard Mumford Jones which are referred to elsewhere in this paper.
 47. Beecher, *Autobiography*, I, 342.
 48. See Sidney E. Mead, *Nathaniel William Taylor 1786-1858; a Connecticut Liberal* (Chicago, 1942), chapters iv and vi.
 49. Beecher, *Autobiography*, I, 543.
 50. See Jones, *America and French Culture*, chap. xi; Koch, *Republican Religion*, chap. viii; Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, chap. vi. The prevailing opinion of these revivals around the middle of the nineteenth century is suggested in James Gallaher's reference to "this outpouring of the Spirit of God, by which the overspreading tide of infidelity was arrested, and the west transformed into a Christian Land" (*The Western Sketch-Book*, 58).
 51. Garrison, *The Annals*, 19-20. For the development of revivalism during the period following the Revolution, see W. W. Sweet, *Religion in the Development of American Culture 1765-1840* (New York, 1952), chapters iv and v.
 52. Robert E. Thompson, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States* (New York, 1895), 34; Leonard W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* (New York, 1900), 176. Both of these books are in the *American Church History Series*.
 53. "The great Methodist movement . . . can appeal to no great intellectual construction explanatory of its modes of understanding. It may have chosen the better way. Its instinct may be sound. However that may be, it was a notable event in the history of ideas when the clergy of the western races began to waver in their appeal to constructive reason." A. N. Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, (New York, 1933), 27-28.
 54. Wade C. Barclay, *History of Methodist Missions*, volume II, *To Reform the Nation* (New York, 1950), 8.
 55. Compare, Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*, 22: "In New England God-fearing Baptists and Methodists were usually Jeffersonians but at the same time were backbone of the evangelical movement which more than anything else was responsible for the decline of deism." And see Koch, *Republican Religion*, 281-82.
 56. Compare J. H. Randall and J. H. Randall, Jr., *Religion and the Modern World* (New York, 1929), 26-27: "Western society confronted the disruptive forces of science and the machine with a religious life strangely divided. On the side of moral and social ideals and attitudes . . . Christianity had already come to terms with the forces of the modern age. . . . On the side of beliefs, however, Christianity in the early 19th century had not come to terms with the intellectual currents of Western society. It found itself, in fact, involved in a profound intellectual reaction against just such an attempt at modernism."

57. *American Renaissance*.
58. *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (New York, 1940), Part III.
59. Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1949), 263.
60. Quoted in Jones, *America and French Culture*, 410. Harriet Martineau says that she expected that in America under religious freedom there would be great religious diversity and even many atheists. But she was struck by "the absence of such diversity." There was, she found, a striking "approach to uniformity of profession" and while "there are many ways of professing Christianity in the United States . . . there are few, very few men . . . who do not carefully profess Christianity in some form or another. This, as men are made, is unnatural." *Society in America* (London, 1837), III, 224 ff.
61. That this was really the case is borne out by Albert Post's study of *Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850* (New York, 1943). See my review in *Journal of Religion*, XXIV (Oct. 1944), 293-94.
62. J. L. Diman, "Religion in America, 1776-1876," *North American Review*, CXXII (Jan., 1876), 42. This view is confirmed by Wilhelm Pauck, "Theology in the Life of Contemporary American Protestantism," *The Shane Quarterly*, XIII (April, 1952), 37-50.
63. See my "Church and State in the United States" a review-article dealing with A. P. Stokes three volumes of that title, in *Religion in Life*, XX (Winter, 1950-51), 41.
64. I have developed this idea in my review of R. Freeman Butts, *The American Tradition in Religion and Education* (Boston, 1950) in the *Journal of Religion*, XXXII (April, 1952), 141-142.
65. *Course of American Democratic Thought*, p. 38.
66. K. S. Latourette, *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV, 415.

THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH AND THE HOME MISSIONARY MOVEMENT BEFORE 1863: A STUDY IN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS ISOLATION

GLENN WEAVER, *Connecticut College*

Shortly before the opening of the nineteenth century there began what American historians have chosen to call the Home Missionary Movement. This phenomenon in American social and religious history must not be confused with "church extension," for its purpose was not to extend religious denominations as such, but rather to "save souls." This missionary enterprise was carried out chiefly by various missionary "societies"—both denominational and interdenominational. Some of these groups were all-inclusive in their missionary interests, but others were limited to specific phases of the work, such as the distributional enterprises. While these organizations flourished along the Atlantic seaboard, their chief concern was the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants of the frontier where the easterners believed that shameful lawlessness and immorality prevailed.

Although the Home Missionary Movement had gathered considerable momentum in almost all of the English-speaking denominations during the early years of the nineteenth century, the German Reformed Church was comparatively slow in entering into the activities which characterized the movement. The reason for this early inactivity may be found, not in any lack of interest in the extension of Protestant Christianity, but in certain limitations and inclinations peculiar to this communion.

For many years the German Reformed Church remained a small provincial body. By the year 1820, when most other evangelical denominations had extended their lines hundreds of miles inland, the German Reformed Church could boast of slightly more than 20,000 active communicant members¹ concentrated chiefly in southeastern Pennsylvania, and in widely-scattered denominational outposts in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. The sixty-eight active pastors of that time were necessarily more concerned with the preservation of the denomination's mere existence than with stimulating popular interest in the Home Missionary cause. Indeed, since the German language was almost universally used in the German Reformed Church until well into the nineteenth century, contacts with sister-churches were not so common as among English-speaking denominations, and this use of the German language also may have tended to prevent a feeling of kinship with other bodies. As indicative of this it may be said that the Second Great Revival almost passed unnoticed by the German Reformed Church, not only because

of the language barrier but also because the catechetical system which this denomination cherished almost precluded emotional revivalism on an extended scale.

With the development within the German Reformed Church of the so-called "Mercersburg Theology" came an aversion to New England theology, and thus the interdenominational agencies, many of them strongly Congregational in their membership, were eyed with suspicion by the Reformed people. An even more serious obstacle to the cause of home missions was the internal conflict engendered by the opposition to Mercersburg Theology. The doctrinal and liturgical controversies which began in the 1840's continued until late in the nineteenth century and consumed much of the energy which might have been otherwise directed toward home missions.² Further, the problem of supporting a theological seminary during its early years also retarded the development of missionary interest, for in the period from 1825 until the middle of the century the Seminary at Mercersburg was regarded as one of the chief objects of denominational benevolence. Again, having come from the Continent, where the state-supported church in practice discouraged benevolent giving so far as the individual members of the denomination were concerned, the Reformed people seem to have had a prejudice against organized benevolence in general, especially that which was conducted by interdenominational agencies.³ Also, as the *Kirchenverein des Westens*, a group containing Lutheran and Reformed elements, grew in influence in the West after 1840, the German Reformed Church may have felt that the Germans of the West were being provided for by this denomination.⁴ Finally, a lack of an orderly system of denominational benevolence hindered *all* phases of denominational work. The boards and agencies within the Church were unable to avoid competition, one with the other, and it was not until late in the nineteenth century that a more systematized plan was put into operation.

Because of a presbyterial polity, the approach to the home missionary question on the part of the German Reformed Church was quite different from that of the Baptists, Congregationalists, or Methodists. The polity of the Church did not encourage the extensive lay participation which characterized the early New England missionary societies, and the insistence of the denomination upon an educated clergy did not permit the lay-preaching which was the source of strength in Baptist and Methodist groups.⁵ Thus, it is evident that the earliest missionary efforts and interests were purely clerical and that the work consisted simply of organizing congregations and supporting pastors.

Before the organization of the Coetus in 1747⁶ a number of independent congregations were organized in Southeastern Pennsylvania by John Philip Boehm, Philip Leydich, and others.⁷ In 1746 Michael

Schlatter was sent to America by the Reformed Church of Holland to make a survey of conditions existing in the German Reformed congregations and, if possible, to organize them into an ecclesiastical body.⁸ Although his efforts resulted in the organization of the Coetus at Philadelphia in 1747,⁹ for over fifty years the congregations relied upon the Church of Holland for support.

Gradually, however, the Coetus assumed financial responsibility for at least a part of its obligations. References to funds collected by clergy and laymen for the erection of church buildings, support of indigent pastors, and similar causes are to be found among the earliest records of the Coetus,¹⁰ and records of appointments for service in communities, which later would have been called missionary regions, are numerous. This unsystematic program of denominational extension continued throughout the eighteenth century and was practically unaltered when the Synod of the Reformed Church was created in 1792 to replace the Coetus.

In 1812 the Synod outlined a definite program for the support of this purely denominational missionary work. It was decided that two ministers be appointed for missionary service and that, for their support, a collection was to be taken up in each congregation. Two licentiates were to be, at their own offer, appointed to make a "missionary journey" and Mr. Samuel Helffenstein of Philadelphia was appointed treasurer to receive the monies collected for this object.¹¹

The following year (1813) Synod resolved that *all* licentiates, prior to taking charge of congregations, would make a missionary tour to "distant desolate regions" for two or three months, the expense of these tours to be paid by the Synod.¹² The first of these, James R. Reily, was appointed to make a tour of North Carolina at a salary of \$30 a month, including traveling expenses, "beside the incidental support he might receive from the congregations themselves."¹³ Later in the same year (1813) Isaac Gerhart, a theological student, spent three months in missionary work in western Pennsylvania.¹⁴ In 1814 William Hauck, also a licentiate, was authorized to serve several congregations in South Carolina,¹⁵ at a salary of \$30 (per month) to be paid from the missionary treasury.¹⁶ In 1815 licentiates were sent to Ohio,¹⁷ North Carolina, and western Pennsylvania.¹⁸ The following year a licentiate was again sent to Ohio.¹⁹

In 1819 the Synod appointed a Missionary Committee consisting of four clergymen: Lewis Mayer, Jonathan Helffenstein, James R. Reily, and F. Rahouser, all young men who had been indentified with the already mentioned missionary activity of the Church. This committee, in response to an appeal from congregations in North Carolina, selected one George Leidy as missionary pastor to serve

the Reformed congregations of that state. The missionary committee estimated, in that year, that eighteen pastoral charges in the East were vacant and that the total number of vacant pastorates in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio totalled two hundred. Synod gave serious attention to the report and in 1821 directed that all pastors should explain to their people the objects of mission work and should take an offering for the furtherance of the cause. The year following James R. Reily gave an account at the meeting of Synod of his 1400 mile missionary tour of the West with the result that the Synod of 1823 voted \$200 toward the traveling expenses of missionaries.²⁰ To enlist lay support the Missionary Committee in 1826 recommended that Synod organize a Board of Home Missions,²¹ and as a result there was created that year the American Missionary Society of the German Reformed Church.²² According to the constitution of this society, everyone who paid one dollar became a member of this society; those who contributed twenty-five dollars became life members; contributors of \$100 became directors; and contributors of \$200 became honorary vice-presidents.²³ From its own membership the society elected a Board of Missions with executive powers. This Board, consisting of twenty-four members, administered the missionary enterprises as well as the benevolent and publication interests of the German Reformed Church.²⁴ This society therefore offered to the members of the German Reformed Church an opportunity to participate in mission work to almost the same extent as their Methodist and Baptist brethren. Whatever high hopes the Reformed missionary enthusiasts may have entertained, however, soon passed away, for the German laymen still retained their aversion to organized benevolence. As the opposition became greater and protests were heard from many quarters of the Church, Synod went to great lengths to explain that the society was a voluntary organization and that it did not operate as a Board of the Synod.²⁵

In 1832 Synod changed the form of the organization and created a new Board of Missions composed of 18 members: two from each Classis²⁶ and four elected from the church at large.²⁷ Support for the work of this new Board was expected to come from projected local auxiliary societies, but these were slow in being organized. The earliest of these were at Frederick, Maryland and Germantown, Pennsylvania, both of which were composed entirely of women.²⁸

Susquehanna Classis organized itself in 1832 into an auxiliary society, and Eastern Synod directed all the classes to do the same. But prejudices soon developed against the American Missionary Society, with which the Reformed Church entered into an agreement in 1834, and the classes, refusing to work with the Board, kept their work

and their funds in their own hands.²⁹ Typical of this action by the classes was Maryland Classis' resolution made in 1834 to send out missionaries under its own supervision.³⁰ While the independent missionary activity of the classes was deplored by the Board of Missions, the Board was helpless because of lack of funds. In 1834 only fifty dollars was granted for the support of a single missionary laboring in western Pennsylvania.³¹ Embarrassing as the situation of the Board had become, Synod in this year was reminded by the Board of the spiritual plight of the German immigrants who were constantly moving to the West.³²

Seemingly out of keeping with the Board's ideal of centralized administration, this body, apparently as a last resort, recommended that the Synod encourage the classes "to form themselves into missionary associations, auxiliary to the Board of Missions, and that while they should by no means neglect to provide for the destitution within their own borders, they do all they can to sustain the operations of the Parent Institution." Upon the Synod's acceptance of the recommendation,³³ the independent activity of the classes at least received official sanction. By 1828 each Classis had "either an auxiliary or a Classical Missionary Society." Most of these supported missionaries of their own appointment—still refusing to support the "Parent Board." Individual pastors, however, occasionally took up collections among their own charges to aid the general "Board" in its work.³⁴

In 1845 the Ohio Synod, which had been organized in 1824, set up its own Board of Home Missions³⁵ patterned after the Board of the Eastern Synod.³⁶ As may have been expected, the poverty of the western branch of the Church forced the "Eastern Board" to assume a major part of the financial responsibility which the missionary enterprise entailed. Nevertheless, an interchange of fraternal delegates and other official communication marked the parallel history of the two groups.³⁷

As has already been noted, for several years prior to the organization of the Ohio Board, the Eastern Board had been in precarious circumstances because of lack of popular interest in a centralized missionary agency. In 1840 it had but three missionaries in its employ, all operating in the East: one at Trenton, New Jersey; one at Philadelphia; and one at Winchester, Virginia.³⁸ By 1843 the number had been reduced to two.³⁹ The following year the Maryland Classis requested Synod to dissolve the Board of Missions and to allow each classis to carry on its own missionary projects without the censure of either Synod or Synodical Board.⁴⁰ As the Synod did not act favorably upon this suggestion, the Synodical Board continued to struggle along on the most limited financial support, receiving in 1847 only \$361.28 in contributions from the entire denomination.

Realizing the futility of operating under such discouraging circumstances, the Board in 1847 declared in its report to the Synod that it existed little more than in name and if it were to justify its existence, a new policy of administration would have to be adopted. Acting upon the suggestion, the Synod completely re-vamped the missionary organization and approved the creation of the office of "Missionary Superintendent" or "Agent." Under the new administrative policy it became the task of the Superintendent to visit missionary territory, to supervise the activities of the missionaries, and to report to the Board and Synod on the progress of the work in the field. The first "Missionary Superintendent," the Reverend Samuel Miller, was sent to the West by both "Eastern" and "Ohio" Boards.⁴¹

In 1848 a plea came to the "Eastern" Board for missionary aid in Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Louisiana,⁴² but no missionaries were available at that time. The following year, however, the Board, realizing the need of the church in the West, prevailed upon the Eastern Synod to urge all pastors to direct worthy young men from their congregations to enter the college and seminary at Mercersburg to prepare for home mission work in the West.⁴³ At last the missionary appeal met with success. By 1852, seventeen missionaries operating in the Middle-West were receiving aid from the Eastern Mission Board;⁴⁴ in 1854 the Board had sixteen missionaries commissioned to congregations in the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Kentucky;⁴⁵ in 1855 Ohio had six of its missionaries; Pennsylvania had four; New York and Indiana each had two; and Wisconsin, Iowa, and Kentucky each had one.⁴⁶ In 1861 thirty-four missionaries were being partially supported by it at an expense to the Synod of \$3,600.00.⁴⁷

Paralleling the later denominational development described above, there was also a bit of inter-denominational activity which gradually drew the German Reformed Church out from its cultural isolationism into the broader world of American evangelical Christianity.

In 1821 several members of the German Reformed Church entered into an unofficial interdenominational missionary venture, in organizing, in cooperation with members of the Reformed Dutch Church and various branches of the Presbyterian Church, the United Domestic Missionary Society.⁴⁸ The direct outgrowth of this organization was the American Home Missionary Society, founded in 1826 by members of the Presbyterian, Associate Reformed, Congregational, and Reformed Dutch Churches. Later all except the Congregationalists withdrew and the Society therefore became purely Congregational in its membership.⁴⁹

The first German Reformed minister to be commissioned by the American Home Missionary Society was Abraham Berky, who was sent into the field in 1834. Berky, however, never left the East but served pastorates in Berks County, Pennsylvania, and in Rochester, New York.⁵⁰ In that year this Society at the Synod of Harrisburg offered its support to the German Reformed Church.⁵¹ While the offer was not accepted at the time, Zion's Classis in October 1834 overtured the Synod

"to open correspondence with the A.H.M.S., also the Board of Missions of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Board of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and also with some regularly formed Missionary Society or theological institution of Europe, affectionately asking them to cooperate in sending well qualified missionaries to labor in the immense field that presents itself before the German Reformed Church and grant our board whatever pecuniary aid they can afford."

The overture was "tabled" by the Synod, possibly because of action taken by the other classes; North Carolina and West Pennsylvania classes alone (both of which were constantly in search of missionary recruits) had acted favorably on the matter.⁵² At the next Synod the question was again opened. Dr Absolom Peters, Secretary of the American Home Missionary Society, stated the principles of the society and outlined a program of cooperation. Upon the recommendation of a committee which conferred with Dr. Peters, the Synod entered into an agreement with the Society whereby missionaries appointed by either the Reformed Mission Board or the Society were to work in the West in the interest of the German Reformed Church but were to be supported primarily by the agency making the appointment.⁵³

The first missionary to be thus aided under the agreement with the Society was the Reverend F. M. Raschig, who received additional assistance from the Young Men's Missionary Society of Easton, Pennsylvania, while laboring among the German immigrants of Cincinnati, Ohio.⁵⁴ By 1837 thirteen German Reformed missionaries were receiving assistance from the same organization.⁵⁵ This was the last year in which Reformed missionaries received such aid. These relations probably ended at this particular time because of the desire of the classes to support missionaries of their own choosing and also because of the growing denominational consciousness which was to characterize the church during the next few decades.

Another similar interdenominational agreement was drawn up in 1845 when the Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church adopted a plan for the cooperation of the two denominational Mission Boards, whereby each Board would send out missionaries to labor among either German or Dutch constituencies, according to need, organizing congregations to be affiliated with either communion depending upon

choice of the congregation itself. This plan never passed beyond the experimental stage.⁵⁶

In 1836 a "Report on the State of Religion" read before the Synod mentioned the fact that Bible and tract societies, temperance efforts, and kindred enterprises were becoming more generally known and better understood by the people of the church and that many of the old prejudices against missionary agencies were disappearing.⁵⁷ Although this may have been something of an overstatement, it is true that in November 1835 the students of the Seminary of the German Reformed Church constituted themselves as an auxiliary of the American Tract Society.⁵⁸ This affiliation, however, was a nominal one as no financial contributions were made. In 1838 the Pennsylvania Female Bible Society was formed by the women of the First German Reformed Church of Philadelphia in the hope that other churches of the state would "rally around it and give their prayers and hearty cooperation to this . . . enterprise" to provide for the "many German families in the interior [who were] destitute of the word of God."⁵⁹ This Society cooperated with the Pennsylvania Bible Society for many years and was several times recommended by Synod to the pastors and people.⁶⁰

The American Tract Society, referred to above, was officially introduced to the German Reformed Church in 1837 when that Society presented to the Synod twelve copies of its annual reports. These reports were carefully considered by a Synodical committee and were recommended to the various classes for further study and consideration.⁶¹ The following year (1838) the Synod resolved to "cheerfully afford every facility in its power, to the agents of this Society, to promote the circulation of its publications, with the hope, that the day . . . [would be] not far distant, when standard works in the German language . . . [would] also be issued by the same Society . . . to extend the benefits contemplated by this enterprise, to the German population of our state and country."⁶² The Reverend R. S. Cook, one of the Tract Society's secretaries, addressed the Synod at a special meeting in June 1843 and support for the Society was again recommended to the pastors.⁶³ In that same year the American Tract Society presented fifty-seven volumes to the library of the Seminary,⁶⁴ and, probably as an exchange of courtesies, the Synod recommended to the church at large the *American Messenger*, the official organ of the Society.⁶⁵

Sunday Schools were slow in making their appearance in German Reformed congregations. At first it was not merely because of a lack of interest, but rather because of open hostility to an institution which might seem to jeopardize the place in the denominational

system of catechetical instruction and also the continuance of the parochial schools, but also to a fear of an infiltration of pietism, since the Sunday School was prominent in the program of radical Protestantism. The earliest German Reformed Sunday School was begun about 1806 in the Race Street Church at Philadelphia. After the early opposition to this form of religious instruction had spent its force, the denomination as a whole became surprisingly favorable to it, and in 1834 a Reverend Mr. Bacon, agent for the American Sunday School Union, was invited to present the cause of the Union before the Synod. His appeal met with such favor that a committee was appointed to confer with him on working out a plan of operation. The committee, after conference with Mr. Bacon, recommended that a Sunday School Union of the German Reformed Church in the United States be organized as an auxiliary to the American Sunday School Union and that each Classis organize an auxiliary to the denominational Union. The Synod accepted this recommendation and ordered the committee to examine and approve available literature to be supplied by the American Sunday School Union for use in the German Reformed Church.⁶⁶ Auxiliary Sunday School Unions were soon founded by a number of the Classes,⁶⁷ and in 1836 an agent was appointed by the American Sunday School Union to visit the congregations of the German Reformed Church.⁶⁸ The growth of Sunday Schools in the German Reformed Church during the next few years was phenomenal. In a single Classis, for example, East Pennsylvania, the number of Sunday Schools had risen from four in 1840 to almost fifty in 1844.⁶⁹ In the West a similar growth occurred and by 1852 there were 120 "Sabbath Schools" reported in Ohio Synod. Some western congregations even developed out of Sunday Schools which had been established by Reformed clergymen.⁷¹

In keeping with the broader missionary spirit of the times, the German Reformed missionary advocates early learned the value of missionary periodicals. The earliest of these, the *Magazine of the German Reformed Church*,⁷² begun under the sponsorship of the Mission Board, devoted many pages to the subject of home missions, and served as the propaganda vehicle for the Board. *The Guardian*, a magazine for young people, first published in 1850, attempted to acquaint the youth of the denomination with the missionary program of the Church.⁷³ The cause of missions found its way to the pages of other Church periodicals. In the second volume of the *Mercersburg Review* (November, 1850) appeared an article entitled "Immigration," presenting the need for increased mission work among the immigrant population of America.⁷⁴ For a time after 1837 the Board of Missions published *Die Christliche Zeitschrift* in the interest of

the vast German-speaking element of the Reformed Church.⁷⁵ The Synod in 1838, upon the suggestion of the Home Mission Board, urged pastors to encourage the circulation of this periodical to combat the influence of "six or eight German infidel publications" then in circulation.⁷⁶

Because of its four-fold literary heritage, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, the *German Hymnal*, the *Palatinate Liturgy*, and Bible, the German Reformed Church had long given high place to the printed page as an instrument in the advancement of the cause of Christianity.⁷⁷ In 1791, for example, the Coetus resolved to petition Congress to require every edition of the Bible subsequently to be published in the United States to be "examined," presumably by the clergy, to insure the correctness of text.⁷⁸ Although the German Reformed Church never sponsored the publication of an edition of the Bible, nevertheless, before 1863 sixty-seven editions of the *Heidelberg Catechism* appeared in America.⁷⁹ Between 1725 and 1863 there also appeared at least 123 works by Reformed clergymen dealing with "doctrine, devotion, and education,"⁸⁰ whose purpose was to indoctrinate the reader according to the tenets of the German Reformed Church, or to vindicate the position of particular parties within the communion. Thus, most of these titles would properly be regarded as missionary tracts. The missionary motive is further evidenced by the fact that the Board of Missions, during its early years, supervised the official publication interests of the Church.⁸¹ A printing establishment was opened at Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, in 1840, which was under control of the Mission Board until the Eastern Synod formed its Board of Publication in 1844.⁸² On August 27, 1858, the German Book Society was organized at Galion, Ohio, to supply the western branch of the Church with religious literature.⁸³

During the early years the educational resources of the German Reformed Church were pathetically meagre. Aside from the parochial school connected with some of the larger congregations, Franklin College at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, founded in 1787 in cooperation with the Lutheran Church,⁸⁴ was the only institution of "higher learning" supported by the denomination.⁸⁵ Franklin College, however, failed to serve the purpose for which it was founded: "to have our youth instructed in such languages and sciences as to qualify them to fill public offices in the Republic, and . . . to prepare young men for the ministry,"⁸⁶ as for over fifty years this institution was little more than a preparatory school.⁸⁷

As early as 1817 the Synod had considered a plan to establish a theological school in cooperation with the Lutheran and Reformed Dutch Churches. This did not materialize, and it was not until 1820

that a second plan—this time for a solely denominational institution—got underway. The more missionary-minded element of the church proposed Frederick, Maryland (in a region then regarded as missionary territory) as the ideal location for the seminary; the more conservative element insisted on a location which was more central to the denomination's membership.⁸⁸

The Seminary finally opened in 1825 in the buildings of Dickinson College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Lewis Mayer, who had been closely identified with the early missionary activity of the Synod, was the first professor. The support for the Seminary was, at first, feeble. By October 1, 1826 only four pastors had taken up collections amounting to a total of \$58. James Ross Reily, another of the Synod's pioneer missionaries, then pastor of the church at Hagerstown, Maryland, visited Germany, Holland, and Switzerland in the interest of the Seminary and returned to the United States on November 16, 1826 with five hundred books and \$5,042 in cash for the institution.⁸⁹ In 1829 the Seminary, still in serious financial straits, was moved to York, Pennsylvania,⁹⁰ and in 1834 the Reverend David Bossler, under appointment of Synod as agent for the Seminary, made a three months tour of the German Reformed Churches collecting \$1,428.35 in cash and pledges amounting to over \$1400. Bossler was instructed by the Synod to confer with the Board of Trustees of the Seminary before making a *second* tour in order that he might not cover the territory assigned to other agents subsequently to be appointed.⁹¹

The Seminary's sister institution, Marshall College, which had been founded at York in 1831 as the "Classical School," was moved to Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, in 1835.⁹² A year later the Seminary also located at Mercersburg. Here financial conditions were little better than before, despite the fact that the Board of Education, which had been created for the assistance of indigent theological students, also made financial grants to the Seminary.⁹³

At the Synod of Baltimore in 1836 the Reverend William Patton, agent of the American and Presbyterian Education Societies, addressed the Synod presenting the principles of the operations of his Society.⁹⁴ The Synod resolved to authorize the Board of Education to seek financial aid for the educational institutions of the German Reformed Church from the American and Presbyterian Education Society.⁹⁵ No satisfactory arrangement could be agreed upon, however, and the subsequent Synodical minutes make no further reference to this Society.

The increasing number of German immigrants and the rapid growth of the Church in Western Pennsylvania and Ohio made it

imperative that some provision be made for theological education in the West. Here, as earlier in the East, the apprentice system was the only means of training ministers. As early as 1833 the Ohio Synod had considered plans for the opening of a theological institution,⁹⁶ but financial embarrassment prevented the opening of a seminary in the mission field. However, in 1835 the "Eastern" Board of Missions brought the need of theological training in the West to the attention of the Synod in a lengthy report⁹⁷ and the following year Eastern Synod appointed a committee to meet with delegates from the western branch of the Church to discuss the possibility of opening a theological seminary in the West.⁹⁸ On August 14, 1838 the first professor in a Seminary which opened at Canton, Ohio, (evidently supported entirely by Western funds) was inaugurated. This institution existed for only eighteen months.⁹⁹ In 1844 a second attempt was made to found a Seminary in Ohio, but as no students enrolled, the institution never opened.¹⁰⁰ In 1846 an academy was founded at Columbus with the hope that it might develop into a theological institution, and shortly thereafter a similar school was founded at Lancaster, Ohio. These two institutions were merged as "The Ohio Literary and Theological Institution" in 1848 and opened at Columbus with one professor and five students. Two years later this school was moved to Tiffin where, as Heidelberg College, it conducted preparatory, collegiate, and theological departments.¹⁰¹

In North Carolina Classis the first expressed interest in higher education came directly from missions when, in 1834, it resolved that the members of Classis form an Education Society and auxiliaries for the purpose of aiding young men from the Classis in their preparation for the ministry. The constitution of this Society granted membership to all who would pay annual dues of two dollars. The first student who was aided by this Society was ordained on August 5, 1838.¹⁰² The funds of this Education Society were augmented by the raising of the "Lorentz Beneficiary-ship" of \$5000 by the western section of the Classis and the "Boger Beneficiary-ship" of \$1,500 by the Central portion of the Classis between 1841 and 1844. From these funds a number of young men received support while pursuing their studies at Mercersburg, but as railroad transportation was not available in the South at the time, the plan of sending students to Pennsylvania was impracticable. Consequently, in 1848 North Carolina Classis appointed a committee to lay plans for the opening of a college to be supported by the Classis. The members of the committee visited the North Carolina congregations presenting the cause of the soon-to-be-founded school, and by June 6, 1851 they had raised the sum of \$10,675. This institution was opened at Newton, North Carolina on December 3, 1851 as Catawba College.¹⁰³

Throughout its early history Catawba College, like her sister institutions in Pennsylvania and Ohio, suffered from want of financial support. For many years it functioned as an elementary and preparatory school. Indeed, the North Carolina Classis was in no position to support a college, and the president of the institution found his chief occupation in visiting congregations to raise funds.¹⁰⁴ Attempts to secure aid in the North were futile, and support from the Church at large was not realized until the following century.¹⁰⁵

The foregoing account of the missionary activity of the German Reformed Church before 1863 would seem to indicate that the part of that communion in the Home Missionary Movement could be described in three terms: feeble, sporadic, and geographically limited. Especially would this be true in the light of one writer's description of the movement as the sum of the activities of the missionary organization.¹⁰⁶ While the fact that the Church *did* advance westward is not to be denied, this activity was largely "Church Extension" rather than Home Missions work, because the work was denominational rather than interdenominational, thus falling largely outside the pattern set by the evangelically minded Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists. Furthermore, even this program differed from the conventional pattern, as it was not so much the result of Board-supported missionaries as it was the labors of a very considerable number of self-sacrificing pastors who had permanently identified themselves with their congregations and communities. Certain exceptions, however, must be noted. The New York Classis, the West Pennsylvania Classis, and the Ohio Classis may be described as Missionary Classes during their early years, since most of the clergymen who assisted in their organization were, at the time, under commission as missionaries. It may be further noted that the "missionary tour" which seems to have been the chief form of missionary activity in the 20's and the 30's was made, not in the interest of making converts in frontier areas or even in establishing new congregations, but rather as a means of preserving or reviving congregations which were already in existence. Thus it would further seem that congregations were founded and classes organized largely through efforts wholly outside the pattern of activities called the Home Missionary Movement, and that the limited participation of the German Reformed Church in this movement was largely on the periphery.

The apparently half-hearted and perfunctory recommendations made by the Synod for prayers in support of such agencies as the American Sunday School Union, the American Tract Society, and the American Bible Society, reveal little interest in these organiza-

tions other than as they immediately affected the denomination. The cooperation between the German Reformed Church and the American Home Missionary Society was, perhaps fortunately so far as the German Reformed Church was concerned, short-lived. Temperance societies were hardly even brought to the attention of the Church, and there seems to be no evidence of any contacts with the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West.

With these facts so evident, it may be safely said that the influence of the German Reformed Church on the Home Missionary Movement was insignificant compared with the influence of the Movement upon the German Reformed Church. Having been late in entering upon the scene as a major denomination, the period between 1790 and 1863 may be regarded as the formative period during which the thought, attitudes, and general outlook of the denomination crystallized. During this period most of the benevolent agencies of the German Reformed Church came into being, and there can be little doubt that the interdenominational contacts experienced—few and unwelcome as they may have been—had some effect upon the administrative policies of the denomination. Furthermore, while these sporadic efforts in interdenominational cooperation brought little tangible gain for the denomination, the latitudinarian spirit of the Church in the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries took its root, in all probability, in these contacts.

In individual congregations, too, may be seen the effects of the movement. While a proportionally small number of congregations came into being because of specific missionary efforts, many of the older congregations in certain sections of the East experienced something of a revival of "New-Measure" pietism in the form of the "Weekly Concert of Prayer for Missions."¹⁰⁷

Certainly it may be said that, despite the linguistic and financial handicaps, the internal contention between opposing parties, and also the peculiar prejudices which prevented its taking a more active part in the Home Missionary Movement, the German Reformed Church made significant numerical gains during the period and exerted a considerable influence upon American religious life. The denomination *was* interested in the extension of Christianity, but it was *specifically* interested in spreading a Reformed brand of Protestantism. By 1864 the denomination's membership was 107,394 with 460 pastors serving 1,134 congregations. The foundation had been laid for one of the larger American religious bodies which by 1890 had again doubled its membership,¹⁰⁸ reached the Pacific Coast, and had planted outposts beyond the sea.

1. H. M. J. Klein, *The History of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States* (Lancaster, Pa., 1943), p. 373.
2. The opposition to Mercersburg Theology centered in what came to be known as the Ursinus Movement.
3. German Reformed Church, *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America*, Records of 1836, p. 33.
4. Carl E. Schneider, *The German Church on the American Frontier* (St. Louis, Missouri, 1939), p. 2 *et passim*.
5. During the early years of the Reformed Church's history, a number of congregations in outlying regions employed "lay readers" who were selected from their members to provide spiritual edification until an ordained pastor could be secured. Two characteristics of these "lay readers" distinguished them from the "lay preachers" of the revivalistic sects: 1) the best educated man in the community, often the school-master, was usually selected, and 2) instead of preaching extemporaneous sermons, as was the custom among frontier Baptists and Methodists, the "lay reader" simply read selections from books of sermons or homilies. Seldom did they attempt to administer the rites or Sacraments. Many of these "lay readers" were subsequently ordained to the ministry. For a fuller account see William J. Hinke, *Life and Letters of the Reverend John Philip Boehm* (Philadelphia, 1916) and *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania* (Phila., 1903), p. 4, *et passim*.
6. The Coetus was a missionary Synod subject to the authority of the Reformed Church in Holland.
7. *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus*, p. 1, *et passim*.
8. Joseph Henry Dubbs, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania* (Lancaster, Pa., 1902), pp. 145-148.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
10. *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus*, p. 38, *et passim*.
11. German Reformed Church, *Acts and Proceedings of Coetus and Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States* (Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1930), Minutes of 1812, p. 58.
12. *Ibid.*, Minutes of 1813, p. 61.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
14. James I. Good, *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1911), p. 190.
15. *Acts and Proceedings of Coetus and Synod*, Minutes of 1814, p. 66.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
17. *Ibid.*, Minutes of 1815, p. 73.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
19. *Ibid.*, Minutes of 1816, p. 78.
20. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-191.
21. Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 362.
22. Charles E. Schaeffer, *The Man From Oregon* (Philadelphia, 1944), p. 53.
23. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
24. Schaeffer, *The Man From Oregon*, p. 53.
25. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
26. The Classis was a sub-division of Synod.
27. Schaeffer, *The Man From Oregon*, p. 53.
28. Charles E. Schaeffer, *Our Home Mission Work* (Philadelphia, 1914), p. 23.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
30. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1835, p. 11.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
34. *Ibid.*, Records of 1838, p. 45.
35. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 626.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
37. Theodore P. Bollinger, "The Western Expansion of the Reformed Church," *Bulletin of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States*, II (January 1931), pp. 66-67.
38. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1840, p. 54.
39. *Ibid.*, Records of 1843, p. 61.
40. *Ibid.*, Records of 1844, p. 22.
41. "In 1850 Rev. Maximilian Stern 'explored' [as missionary agent] the western part of New York and located four ministers in and near Buffalo and laid the foundation for a new classis. Rev. Emanuel V. Gerhart for several years labored in the West as General Agent for the Board. In 1856 Rev. W. K. Zieber of Tiffin, Ohio, was appointed as Superintendent of Missions. . . ." C. E. Schaeffer, *Our Home Mission Work*, pp. 31-32.
42. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1848, p. 51.
43. Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 215.
44. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1852, pp. 49, 53, 63.
45. *Ibid.*, Records of 1854, p. 54.
46. Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 242.
48. C. E. Schaeffer, "The American Home Missionary Society," *Outlook of Missions*, XXXI (October, 1939), p. 273.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 274.
50. Carl E. Schneider, *The German Church on the American Frontier*, p. 63.
51. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1835, p. 54.
52. *Ibid.*, Records of 1835, pp. 13-14.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
54. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.
55. *Ibid.*, Records of 1837, p. 26.
56. In 1845 the Schwenkfelders appropriated their entire denominational mission contributions to the German Re-

- formed Board. *Ibid.*, Records of 1845, p. 15.
57. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1836, p. 33.
 58. American Bible Society, *Twentieth Annual Report of the American Bible Society* (New York, 1836), p. 120.
 59. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1838, p. 17.
 60. *Ibid.*, Records of 1840, p. 7; Records of 1849, pp. 88-89.
 61. *Ibid.*, Records of 1837, p. 14.
 62. *Ibid.*, Records of 1838, p. 53.
 63. *Ibid.*, Records of 1843, p. 11.
 64. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
 65. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
 66. *Ibid.*, Records of 1834, pp. 52-53.
 67. *Ibid.*, Records of 1835, pp. 12-13.
 68. *Ibid.*, Records of 1836, p. 21.
 69. *Ibid.*, Records of 1844, p. 30.
 70. *Ibid.*, Records of 1852, p. 109.
 71. *Ibid.*, Records of 1856, p. 46.
 72. The name of the magazine was changed several times, being named successively *The Messenger of the German Reformed Church*, the *Weekly Messenger of the German Reformed Church*, the *German Reformed Messenger*, the *Reformed Church Messenger*, and the *Messenger*.
 73. J. H. Dubbs, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania* (Phila., 1902), pp. 377-378.
 74. *Mercersburg Review*, II (November 1850), p. 620 ff.
 75. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 639.
 76. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1838, p. 47.
 77. Five years after the organization of the Coetus a number of Bibles had been sent from Holland for the use of the Church in the Colonies, one to be given to each congregation for liturgical reading, and the remainder to be sold or distributed *gratis* to the members of the German Reformed Church, *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus*, Records of 1752, pp. 68-69.
 78. *Ibid.*, Records of 1791, p. 446.
 79. Joseph Henry Dubbs, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania*, pp. 371-374.
 80. *Ibid.*, pp. 357-364.
 81. Charles E. Schaeffer, *The Man From Oregon*, p. 53.
 82. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 369.
 83. *Ibid.*, p. 643.
 84. *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus*, Records of 1787, p. 411; cf. Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 356.
 85. In 1772 the Coetus recommended that pastors take up offerings in their congregations for the support of Queens [Rutgers] College which had been founded in New Jersey by the Reformed Dutch Church. *Minutes and Letters of the Coetus*, Records of 1772, pp. 327-328.
 86. *Ibid.*, Coetal Letter of 1790, p. 441.
 87. Dubbs, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania*, p. 262; cf. the present writer's "The German Reformed Church and the Civil Government (1787-1855)," *Pennsylvania History*, XVI (October, 1949), pp. 310-316.
 88. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-29.
 89. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-66.
 90. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
 91. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1834, pp. 31-32.
 92. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-76.
 93. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1834, p. 9.
 94. *Ibid.*, Records of 1836, pp. 6-7.
 95. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
 96. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-120.
 97. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1835, p. 25.
 98. *Ibid.*, Records of 1836, p. 16.
 99. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-120.
 100. *Ibid.*, pp. 121-122.
 101. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123.
 102. Jacob Calvin Leonard, *History of Catawba College* (Lexington, North Carolina, [1927]), pp. 20-24.
 103. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-36.
 104. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
 105. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
 106. J. Orin Oliphant, "The American Missionary Spirit, 1825-1835," *Church History*, VII (June 1938), p. 127.
 107. *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod*, Records of 1842. The "Concert of Prayer" was really a mid-week prayer meeting.
 108. Layman's Missionary Movement, *Survey of the Reformed Church in the United States* (c. 1914), p. 87.

POBEDONOSTSEV'S RELIGIOUS POLITICS

ARTHUR E. ADAMS, *Michigan State College*

Konstantin Pobedonostsev, over-procurator of the holy synod in the Russian Church from 1880 until 1905, occupies an important place in Russia's history. As adviser and confidant of the last tsars, Alexander III and Nicholas II, he left his firm imprint upon imperial policies during years of crisis. As ruler of the church he also played a significant part in religious affairs—a part which has not yet been accurately evaluated. Too often it has been assumed that ardent religious faith guided his conduct of church affairs, and he has been likened to Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor, or called the Russian Torquemada. In truth, however, Pobedonostsev was a man of politics; more particularly, a man of Russian politics. His main objective was always the preservation of a strong and powerful Russian state; and in almost every act which at first glance appears to have been determined by religious motives, a more critical study reveals the primacy of his political aims.

Although he was deeply religious personally, his recognition of political realities forced him to bend and twist the doctrines of faith to serve the needs of the state. In a recent study, Dr. Robert Byrnes has pointed out that in Pobedonostsev's political theory, "the church was to be a servant and even a weapon of the state."¹ This statement should be altered considerably if it is to define Pobedonostsev's religious policies in action. Under his direction the church was more slave than servant, and religion was a dishonored agent of political stability and state security. The church was not simply subordinated to politics. It had little practical importance apart from its political significance. In all that he did, however, Pobedonostsev hid his true motives behind a facade of religious principles. It is apparent that on some occasions he convinced even himself that he was more Orthodox than Russian, and he persuaded many others that religious precepts alone determined all his policies. Because these tactics of confusion were effective, it is necessary to insist even today that the over-procurator's cloak of sanctity actually covered and concealed a man of politics.

Unless this political approach to the affairs of the church be understood, it is hardly possible to gain an accurate picture of Pobedonostsev's place in the history of the Orthodox Church. Comprehending his fundamentally political character, we are better able not only to evaluate his influence upon the church itself, but also to interpret the part he played in affairs of state. It is the purpose of the present study

to define Pobedonostsev's politico-religious position and to demonstrate some aspects of its significance in practice.

During Pobedonostsev's rule the church engaged in a complex series of efforts to make Orthodoxy the sole faith of the Russian Empire. These proselyting efforts amply demonstrate the essentially political objectives which guided the over-procurator. We will consider first Pobedonostsev's relations with the Catholic Poles in the Western provinces and with the Protestant, Germanized Baltic peoples. Secondly we will consider his struggles against the sects pronounced heretical by the church, and against the schismatics (*Raskolniki*).

I

In the Western provinces, the aim of the government was Russification. Since this was not a simple matter of wiping out a few political institutions, but an attempt to destroy the historical, cultural and religious ideas and customs of whole peoples, Pobedonostsev felt compelled to bring the church into the fight. Under his direction, the church became a major force in forwarding Russian political objectives in this area.

In his struggle against Catholicism, Pobedonostsev found himself fighting a hydra-headed enemy, for he faced not alone the Roman Curia but also, and simultaneously, the Poles and the Austrian government. He was not always able to distinguish among these enemies, and at times he saw himself as the champion of Orthodoxy against a dangerous alliance. He declared to Alexander III in 1881 that the Catholic Church, the Austrian government and the Polish National party were waging a campaign against Russia. "Against our western borders a whole army of priests has been sent," he wrote.² He called this movement a great crusade against the East, and warned the minister of the interior to be on guard.³ And he repeated his warning to the tsar in 1882: "I have already had occasion to call the attention of Your Majesty to the systematic and energetic attack against the Russian nationality and the Orthodox Church. It is completely obvious that this is directed by the unification of three powers: the Roman Curia, in union with the Austrian government and with the Polish National party."⁴ Clearly, in his mind, Russian interests needed stalwart defenders against these combined forces.

To Pobedonostsev, the most dangerous of these Western enemies was the militant Catholic Church, which, he believed, had opposed Russian Orthodoxy for nearly a thousand years:

The interests of the [Catholic] church and of the church's jurisdiction [he wrote to Nicholas II] always have served and serve the Papacy now as a weapon for political purposes, for the aims of the ruling authority. By means of this instrument, the Papacy has become strong, as a conse-

quence of which it must be considered a state, having a considerable number of subject Catholics. It must be considered in affairs of internal administration and in affairs of external politics.⁵

In short, he argued to convince Nicholas that the Catholic Church was a political power and that the Russian state should vigorously repel its attacks. Pobedonostsev, himself, seized every opportunity to bolster the state's defenses. In 1899 he objected strenuously to the presence of a papal nuncio at St. Petersburg. Regarding him as an ambassador from a hostile state, he explained to Nicholas II that "every agreement with Rome written on paper represents danger, because every word expressed becomes an instrument of Roman policy and law which Rome then interprets its own way."⁶ And in 1905 Pobedonostsev bitterly opposed a plan being considered by the state council and the tsar for granting tolerance to other religions. He argued that giving tolerance to the Catholics was tantamount to giving them control of the Western provinces.

The freedom of the Roman Catholic clergy from restrictions called forth by historical necessities, with the presentation to [Roman Catholic clergy] of full freedom to act on the people, threatens for us, not only constraint upon the Orthodox Church, but also the Polonization of the multitudinous Russian population on the [ancient] Russian borders. Already the half-prepared government of Prince Mirsky, a person foreign to Russian history and to Russian life, has introduced into the north-western border such troubles as it will be difficult to quiet. The giving of freedom of action to the Roman Catholic hierarchy and to an army of priests, taking possession of the popular conscience, gives them [the people] into the hands of that power with which both the Russian Church and the Russian state will find it impossible to struggle, and the consequences will be ruinous both for the church and for the state.⁷

Although considering the Roman Church his most dangerous enemy, Pobedonostsev believed that it flourished in the Western provinces because of the Poles. He understood that the mass of Catholics were also Poles, who were "the subjects of an historical struggle." And he believed that all the energies of the Polish Catholics were concentrated on making the whole population of the Western provinces Catholic and Polish. The Pole's "religion is indivisible from his passionate national aspirations, from his hatred of Russia, and it serves him as an instrument of political intrigue against the Russian state."⁸ In short, it was impossible to separate the aspirations of the Pope from those of the Polish nationalists, and the enemy was, above all, a political enemy who constantly threatened the strength of Russian control in the Western provinces. As early as 1879 Pobedonostsev warned the tsarevitch that the Polish Nationalists were the real instigators of Russia's revolutionary problems, and in 1883 he accused them of being "at the center of all the so-called constitutional movements in Russia."⁹ Later in the eighties, he continued to worry about

the dangerous influx of Polish Catholics into the Vitebsk region, some 150,000 of them."¹⁰

In Pobedonostsev's estimation the third member of the Catholic triumvirate, Austria, "not only gives support to the Poles and plays them off against Russia, but also attempts to destroy the Russian influence among other Slavic peoples."¹¹ He observed a steady Polish-German colonization on the southwestern borders and in Austrian Galicia, a region he considered to be, historically, pure Russian.¹² Most frightening to him was a constitutional development which, he believed, gave the Poles control of the Austrian parliament. By means of their parliamentary majority, Pobedonostsev noted, the Austrian Poles had "conceived a whole series of laws for the repression of the Russian nationality" within the Austrian Empire. These laws included measures for the suppression of the Russian language, the introduction of Latin clergy among the Russians, and the substitution of Jesuits for Orthodox monks in Russian monasteries and in parish schools.¹³ In other words, he saw persecution of the Orthodox Russian just beyond the borders, as well as aggressive infiltration of Catholic, Austrian and Polish influences inside those borders. Together, the actions of these three enemies spelled political unrest and Russian weakness, and Pobedonostsev rushed to do what he could to improve the situation.

In his struggle to make the Western provinces Russian and Orthodox, Pobedonostsev combined political and religious measures. He was quick to advise the tsar about the selection of governors, demanding more vigorous Russian administrators in the troubled regions, and asking that efforts be directed toward the strengthening of the Orthodox Russian population.¹⁴ He believed it necessary to put Russia's best foot forward in the Western provinces and called for the establishment of institutions "which could show the local population models of Russian Orthodox and national culture, and arouse sympathy for them."¹⁵ He put great hope in newly established parish schools taught by energetic Russian priests whose first task was to teach the Russian language and the customs of the Orthodox Church.¹⁶ And he put his most militant priests into the fight against the Catholics and Poles. He demanded that these priests be given ample freedom to act effectively, and he assured the tsar that his men had no doubts of their eventual success.¹⁷ He endeavored to limit the freedom of Catholic priests, requesting government support in this effort; he insisted upon continuing the law which prohibited proselytizing to any but Orthodox clergymen; and he demanded enforcement of this law by the civil and military authorities.¹⁸

In sum, Pobedonostsev carried on his struggle against the Cath-

olic faith by any and every means at hand. And it is clear that his struggle was essentially a political struggle, fought from behind the facade of the church.

In addition to the Catholics Pobedonostsev also fought with the Protestant peoples of the Baltic provinces. Here, after the Reformation, Letts and Estonians under the leadership of German nobles had become Lutheran, and the Lutheran clergy had enjoyed considerable authority within the Russian Empire for many years. For Pobedonostsev, however, the rule of the German noble and the Lutheran pastor threatened Russian strength and security. Friedrich Steinmann accurately summarizes Pobedonostsev's policy in the Baltic area: "In order to chain these provinces indisputably to Russia and to destroy forever any possibility of a reuniting of these provinces to Germany, Pobedonostsev believed it necessary to wipe out the existing degree of autonomous administration, to break the power of the German elements and their church, and to bind these provinces to Russia through one law, one faith and one tongue."¹⁹

Acting to "break the power of the German elements and their church," Pobedonostsev labored to establish new Orthodox parishes in the Baltic regions. During the reign of Alexander III, he succeeded in opening thirty-four parishes and in diverting large sums of money for their work.²⁰ He was aided in this endeavor by legislation which put the German or Protestant at a disadvantage. A law of 1884 decreed that only Russians could acquire rural property by "purchase, bequest, or deed or gift."²¹ To be recognized as Russian one had to be Orthodox. By a decree of July 26, 1885, which Pobedonostsev pushed through, an old law was revived whereby children born to parents of mixed religious convictions had to be raised in the Orthodox faith.²² The governor of Livonia, Zinovyev, increased the stringency of this law by an added regulation: All persons entered in the register of the Russian Church would henceforth be considered members of the Russian Church. Thus it was made technically impossible to leave the church.²³ By other measures, the 2,000 Lutheran schools which made the Baltic provinces the best-educated in Russia were handed over to the ministry of public instruction for Russification.²⁴

Early in 1887 Pobedonostsev admitted that Russification in the Baltic regions had produced widespread expression of disapproval in Western Europe. He reported to Alexander III that German newspapers were filled with scandals and slander and false tales of persecution, but he discounted this, because, as he put it, "there are no lies which foreigners will not believe when they are told about Russia."²⁵ However, while denying persecution he carried on

prosecutions. At the end of 1887 he announced to the tsar that of 139 Lutheran pastors in the Baltic region, 53 were charged with various religious deeds deemed to be criminal under the Russian law. And he asked that these clerical criminals be dealt with firmly. If they were to receive privileges, he warned, the Roman Curia would soon be demanding equal rights with the Lutherans. "The embarrassment of the government would be considerable."²⁶

These forceful methods used to transform Protestants into Orthodox Russians aroused bitter criticism and resentment not only in the foreign press but also among various religious groups of Western Europe. In a letter written to Pobedonostsev in 1886, three Swiss pastors of the Reformed Church begged that the persecution of Lutherans be halted and complete liberty be granted to all Christian groups in Russia. Pobedonostsev replied to this request by laying the blame for the conflict in the Baltic areas upon German nobles and Protestant clergymen.²⁷ Following this incident, the Evangelical Alliance, during its general conference of 1886-1887 at Geneva, discussed Russian persecution and sent a petition to Alexander III asking that mercy be shown the Protestants.²⁸ In March of 1888 Pobedonostsev replied for the tsar in an open letter. According to the analysis presented in this letter, the first Baltic Lutherans were merely knights of the Teutonic Order in a new guise. In past centuries they had persistently aroused the Lett and Finnish population against Russia and had sought exclusive domination of Russian lands. They had set up every sort of obstacle to prevent the natives from making any reconciliation with Mother-Russia, and they still continued to foment dissatisfaction and unrest inside the Russian Empire. In view of this history, Pobedonostsev rejected the plea of the Evangelical Alliance. A brief quotation from his letter illustrates the priority of political over purely religious considerations:

Western religions in Russia have always been actuated by a mixture of spiritual and secular motives. Catholicism was impregnated with Polonism; Protestantism, as represented by the Livonian Knights, was equally animated by secular motives. The time for a peaceful cooperation of the Christianity of the East with that of the West has unfortunately not yet arrived, for the Western religions are in Russia still not free from worldly objects, and even from attacks on the integrity of the Empire. Russia cannot allow them to tempt her Orthodox sons to depart from their allegiance, and she therefore continues to protect them by her laws.²⁹

This cold reply called forth, in turn, the dramatic *Open Letter* of Hermann Dalton.³⁰ Dalton, long a pastor of the Reformed Church in St. Petersburg, was personally acquainted with Pobedonostsev and knew well the situation in the Baltic area. In extremely blunt words, he threw the lie in Pobedonostsev's face. Not the Lutheran nobles and

pastors, but Pobedonostsev, was to blame for the persecutions, Dalton declared; and he boldly demonstrated that the over-procurator had falsified evidence in order to prove the existence of a German conspiracy against the empire.³¹ At least one-half the Lutheran clergy had been indicted on one or another count related to the taking of Communion in the Lutheran Church, Dalton charged, and whole parishes were punished along with their pastors for clinging to their faith. Scurrilous and provocative books about Lutheran pastors were being circulated among the Letts and Esths, and the Emperor was awarding medals—the Anna, Third Class—to each Orthodox priest who had converted a hundred souls to Orthodoxy. Concerning the Lutheran schools, Dalton presented convincing evidence of their loyalty and of their superiority to Russian schools.³²

Dalton's vigorous defense was fruitless. Pobedonostsev had decided that the Lutheran-Russian threatened national security, and he continued his oppressions. According to the records of the holy synod, over 37,000 Protestants became Orthodox Christians between the years 1881 and 1894.³³

II

Turning from the Protestant and Catholic conflicts in the border provinces, Pobedonostsev faced a different series of problems in the Russian interior. These internal religious difficulties may be considered most conveniently under two main headings. First is the problem of heresy, represented by the numerous "rationalistic" sects which existed in Russia.³⁴ Second is the problem of dissent, embodied in the *Raskolniki* or schismatics who followed their own versions of Orthodox worship in defiance of the church.

It is impossible to consider in detail Pobedonostsev's relations with each heretical sect which existed in Russia, but representative examples are readily available. Among the heresies, Pobedonostsev considered the Stundist to be one of the most troublesome and dangerous.³⁵ According to an official report of the holy synod, the Stundists acknowledged only the Bible as the source of their faith, completely rejected church ritual, and tried to conceal the existence of their sect from civil authorities. Members of this sect, according to the report of the holy synod, wanted equality for all men and the right to freely divide their property. They recognized no power in the land but God and reflected this attitude in their refusal to recognize the government or to do military service.³⁶ For Pobedonostsev, such precepts made the Stundists not only heretics, but also, and perhaps more important, disloyal, rebellious citizens who threatened the power of the state. To these charges he added others which were even more serious.

During a survey trip through what he called the "infected regions," Pobedonostsev sent a letter to Alexander III explaining why organization against the Stundists was essential. He wrote that "the Stundists, strengthened by the dispersion of propagandists from Germany, from Sweden, from our Baptists and from the *Pashkovtsy*,"³⁷ threaten the peasant settlements with a very dangerous plague."³⁸ Thus he insinuated that Stundists were tainted by connections with foreign governments, and he condemned Stundism as an enemy fifth column which had to be eradicated for political reasons. Thereafter, this charge was made more explicitly. In the "Letter from Simferopol," written by Nikanor, Archbishop of Odessa, and inspired as well as corrected by Pobedonostsev, the Stundists were accused of being "traitors to the Russian tsars, and emissaries of Prince Bismarck and German Lutheranism."³⁹ In 1893 the holy synod declared the Stundists to be the most harmful sect in Russia, and this judgment was confirmed by the tsar.⁴⁰ And in 1901 an official report of the holy synod made this statement about the Stundists:

They expect to be freed by the Germans from the pretended political and social-economic yoke under which the government of Russia would keep them. In a word, the Stundists undermine the basic principles of the Orthodox faith and also undermine the basic virtues of the Russian nationality. Even more, in recent years, the social-political side of the instruction in Stundism has come to predominate over the religious [teaching].⁴¹

While advancing these charges, Pobedonostsev planned and executed various offensives against this heresy. One method he employed was the preparation, printing and distribution of pamphlets and brochures attacking the Stundists and their doctrines. He personally supervised the preparation of many such pamphlets and was instrumental in distributing them. Such propaganda work was designed partly to educate local clergy and to give it ammunition for its struggle, partly to persuade the heretics of their error.⁴² In conjunction with these efforts, he sent in his task forces, the priests, "who worked from morning to night" to destroy the heresy.⁴³

Pobedonostsev also fought the Stundists by organizing conferences of the upper clergy to plan and carry out measures against the heresy. In 1884, for example, Pobedonostsev wrote to Archbishop Nikanor of a plan to ask the Metropolitan of Kiev to call an assembly of bishops from those eparchies where Stundism was prevalent. The assembly was to discuss means of fighting the Stundists, and the over-procurator suggested that it would be useful to prepare an "Epistle" to be signed by all the bishops and issued to the lower clergy.⁴⁴ The council was held, but the "Epistle" was ineffective and disappointing to Pobedonostsev. Nevertheless it was printed and distributed. "I look on this council as our first effort," he wrote to Nikanor; "perhaps time

will show us another road."⁴⁵ He was already planning the new council to be held at Kazan.

In sum, although it is difficult to judge Pobedonostsev's success, it is evident that his battle against the Stundists was a political struggle for loyal citizens rather than a religious effort to save souls.

A second heretical group denounced by Pobedonostsev was one formed under the leadership of Colonel V. A. Pashkov. Organized in 1874, the *Pashkovtsy* called themselves "The Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading," a title which explicitly stated their aims. They soon published a Bible in Russian for distribution throughout the country as a means of spreading Christian enlightenment, and subsequently brought out several hundred diverse pamphlets, some in many editions.⁴⁶ Pashkov, a wealthy landowner, attracted members from both sexes of the upper classes.⁴⁷ And he extended his "infectious" influence far and wide through the lower classes. In 1888, for example, Pobedonostsev claimed that Pashkov's influence had penetrated as far as the Caucasus regions.⁴⁸

Early in the eighties Pobedonostsev set himself resolutely to rid Russia of Pashkov, condemning the brochures disseminated by the organization and castigating the *Pashkovtsy's* moral and material assistance to the Stundists.⁴⁹ His efforts were crowned in 1884 with what appeared to be complete victory. As he proudly explained in two letters to the Archbishop Nikanor, a special council had decreed the banishment of Pashkov from Russia and the tsar had confirmed this decision. The society was officially dissolved, its publications were seized, and Pashkov was warned that should he return to Russia or continue his activities, his estates would be confiscated.⁵⁰ In this case, however, Pobedonostsev did not achieve his purpose. According to a letter of the over-procurator written to the tsar in 1887, Pashkov did not stop his proselytizing when he departed from Russia. On the contrary, he and his agents in Russia continued their work and extended the Pashkov heresy into several new areas.⁵¹ Even more surprising, Pashkov in 1887 and without Pobedonostsev's knowledge, secured official permission to return to Russia. The over-procurator's attacks on the "witless Pashkov" began again, but despite Pobedonostsev's continued efforts, Pashkov remained in Russia working actively until his death in 1902.⁵²

For Pobedonostsev, the *Pashkovtsy* were dangerous primarily because they disseminated the poison of their ideas to other groups. He connected their teachings with those of the Stundists, the Baptists, and the Molokans.⁵³ And he regarded Pashkov as a revolutionary, supported by people of liberal inclinations who combined with him to fight public authority by demanding freedom of propaganda

for their ideas.⁵⁴ Once again the struggle was guided by political rather than religious principles.

The *Raskolniki*, descendants of those schismatics forced out of the church by the reforms of Alexis and Nikon in the 17th century, were especially important because of their numerical strength. The holy synod estimated this strength at two and a quarter million, but other and probably more accurate estimates range from 12 million in 1880 to 20 million in 1900.⁵⁵ Representing dissent rather than outright heresy, the *Raskolniki* presented the church with unique problems. In theory they were all more or less Orthodox; therefore, suppression was not in order, for the church could always hope to win dissenters back to the fold. In reality, however, the *Raskolniki* had multiplied their forms: some groups were close to the church and ready to return to it, but others had long since rejected Orthodox hierarchy, ritual and doctrine to explore the mystic and hysteric horizons of religious experience.

Pobedonostsev's policies in regard to the *Raskol* indicate that he placed considerable emphasis upon the political aspects of dissent, often to the exclusion of religious considerations. It was his belief that all good Russian citizens should be Orthodox Christians, but he placed more emphasis upon *citizen* than upon *Orthodox*. His writings and his policies touching the dissenters show that he was principally concerned with their loyalty to the state and with their orderly conduct within the state. A letter which he wrote for Alexander III in 1886 well illustrates this concern with loyalty. This letter replied to a request by a group of wealthy merchant *Raskolniki* for permission to build a chapel and to have their own priests celebrate the mass. The merchants had attempted to strengthen their petition by warm assurances of their loyalty to the tsar. Pobedonostsev's response to the religious question was curt and brutal. Celebration of the mass he declared to be the exclusive right of Orthodox clergy. Then he took up the question of loyalty:

His Majesty the Emperor is perfectly convinced of the loyalty of the Moscow *Raskolnik* community, as also [of the loyalty] of all those other subjects whose devotion does not have as a condition the issuing of rights and prerogatives that are not justified by the general interests of the state.

In conclusion: the members of the *Raskolnik* community of Moscow have no need to insist in particular upon their loyalty, which is a precious sentiment common to all Russian men, to all the Russian society of which . . . [the Moscow *Raskolniki*] are an integral part. His Majesty the Emperor has always been and remains profoundly convinced of their devotion, which is conditioned neither by the social class nor the institution of which they are a part, nor by the rights and privileges which may be granted them, but [which] rests on the unshakable love of the fatherland and on submission to the Tsar [who] holds his power from God,

that is to say, on the two sentiments inherent in all Russians, inseparable from the Russian nature.⁵⁶

Emphasis again fell upon the question of political loyalty rather than upon the religious errors of the *Raskolniki*. Similar statements were issued in the name of Nicholas II to prevent the *Raskolniki* from persuading themselves that they were in the tsar's good favor.⁵⁷

Pobedonostsev attacked other groups of the *Raskol* because they endangered public order. In other words, he considered them immoral or criminal and worked to correct or to suppress them as a means of preserving Russia's political stability. One group, the Theodosian, may be used to illustrate his approach to this problem. According to Pobedonostsev, there were some 60,000 Theodosians concentrated in western Russia alone. He characterized them as priestless and ignorant, depraved, wicked, and dark. He charged that they rejected marriage and thus destroyed family life, justified polygamy and infanticide and allowed their villages to serve as "nests for thieves, horse-stealers, and evils of every type."⁵⁸ They were especially dangerous, Pobedonostsev believed, not because of their own depravity and corruption but because they could "corrupt whole generations."⁵⁹

To halt the evil done by such groups as the Theodosians, Pobedonostsev used most of his usual methods. He pushed the establishment of parish schools in areas of the deepest ignorance.⁶⁰ In 1882 the holy synod established a special fund for publishing books against the *Raskol*.⁶¹ An eparchial convention of 1884 devised means of fighting the dissenters and planned to establish classes in the clerical seminars to teach Orthodox priests the ways and the errors of the *Raskol*. This same assembly made arrangements for the distribution of anti-*Raskol* literature. It planned the increase of local missionary activities, organized priests for the conversion of the dissenters, worked out means for putting more money for this struggle into the hands of the parish priests, and it decreed that parish priests should read the Bible, especially the New Testament, to the people of the parishes.⁶² In 1886 Pobedonostsev arranged debates between his best orators and the champions of the *Raskol* in order to win the wanderers back to the church.⁶³ Persecution of the *Raskolniki* accompanied the educational and proselytizing efforts. Thus, in 1894 the holy synod forbade priests of the *Raskol* to remain in Moscow. Building of new churches by the *Raskolniki* was prohibited. Public performance of the religious services was proscribed, and their priests were refused the right to wear the clerical habit in public.⁶⁴

All these measures proved to be of doubtful effectiveness. The *Raskolniki* stubbornly refused to accept the teaching of the parish priests or to read any but the old books, and they grimly concentrated upon the old forms of worship.⁶⁵ In fact, Pobedonostsev's efforts

achieved an effect contrary to that which he intended. His continued persecutions provoked the *Raskolniki* to struggle not only for tolerance but also for political rights. With growing insistence they sought relief from persecution; they demanded legal and religious autonomy, their own schools, and free access to civil and military office.⁶⁶ By 1905 they had secured some changes in their favor, despite Pobedonostsev's resistance.

To sum up, Pobedonostsev's efforts to strengthen and extend the Orthodox religion in the western non-Russian provinces as well as among Russian dissenters and heretics exhibit little or no religious zeal. His object was never salvation of the soul. It was, rather, salvation of the Russian Empire, preservation of order, unity and authority under the tsar.

1. R. F. Byrnes, "Pobedonostsev's Conception of the Good Society: An Analysis of His Thought after 1880," *The Review of Politics*, XIII, No. 2 (April, 1951), 178.
2. K. P. Pobedonostsev, *Pisma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III* [Letters of Pobedonostsev to Alexander III] (Moscow, 1925-26, 2 v.) (hereafter cited as "Pisma"), I, 355 (November 11, 1881).
3. K. P. Pobedonostsev, "Pisma K. P. Pobedonostseva k gr. N. P. Ignatyevu," [Letters of K. P. Pobedonostsev to Count N. P. Ignatyev] *Byloye*, Nos. 27-28 (1924) (hereafter cited as "Pisma k Ignatyevu"), p. 62 (October 22, 1881).
4. *Pisma*, I, 373 (February 12, 1882); cf. Pobedonostsev, "Pisma k Ignatyevu," *Byloye*, Nos. 27-28 (1924), pp. 73-74 (April 12, 1882).
5. *Pisma*, II, 324 (September 21, 1899).
6. *Ibid.*, p. 323.
7. K. P. Pobedonostsev, "Iz chernovykh bumag K. P. Pobedonostseva," [From the Rough Drafts of K. P. Pobedonostsev] *Krasny Arkhiv*, XVIII (1926), 204. Prince Peter D. Svyatopolk-Mirsky was minister of the interior, 1904 to January, 1905.
8. *Pisma*, II, 324 (September 21, 1899).
9. *Ibid.*, I, 208-209 (May 17, 1879), 293 (February 15, 1882); II, 13 (March 11, 1883).
10. *Ibid.*, II, 157 (June 23, 1887).
11. Friedrich Steinmann and Elias Hurwicz, *Konstantin Petrowitsch Pobedonostzew der Staatsmann der Reaktion unter Alexander III* (Königsberg, 1933), pp. 68-70; cf. *Pisma*, I, 64-65 (January 10, 1877); Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians* (New York, 1894-96, 3 v.), III, 176-77.
12. *Pisma*, II, 10 (March 11, 1883); II, 154 (June 23, 1887).
13. *Ibid.*, p. 11 (March 11, 1883).
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 157 (June 23, 1887), 183 (July 15, 1888), 258 (May 5, 1892).
15. *Ibid.*, p. 259 (May 5, 1892).
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27 (March 28, 1883), 128-29 (January 21, 1887), 155 (June 23, 1887).
17. *Ibid.*, I, 384-85 (May 24, 1882).
18. *Ibid.*, II, 155-57 (June 23, 1887); Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 513.
19. Steinmann and Hurwicz, p. 74.
20. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya za vremya tsarstvovaniya Imperatora Aleksandra III* [Survey of the Activity of the Department of the Orthodox Religion in the Time of the Reign of Emperor Alexander III] (St. Petersburg, 1901) (hereafter cited as: "*Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*"), pp. 126-31.
21. Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 537.
22. P. I. Biriukov, *L. N. Tolstoi* (Berlin, 1921, 4 v.), III, 495-505.
23. Steinmann and Hurwicz, p. 75.
24. Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 529.
25. *Pisma*, II, 137 (February 28, 1887).
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 166-67 (December, 1887).
27. Steinmann and Hurwicz, pp. 76-77.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 77. The Evangelical Alliance was founded at London in 1846 by a conference of 900 clergymen and laymen from all parts of the world. Its membership in the eighties made it an international organization dedicated to the achievement of freedom of conscience and worship in all lands (D. S. Schaff, "Evangelical Alliance," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings [New York, 1912], V, 601-602).
29. C. Lowe, *Alexander III of Russia* (New York, 1895), p. 221; cf. K. P. Pobedonostsev, *K. P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty, pisma i zapiski* [K. P. Pobedonostsev and his Correspondence, Letters and Records]

- Vol. I: *Novum regnum* (Moscow, 1923), Part II, p. 885; Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 514-15. This open letter was addressed to the president of the Swiss Committee of the Evangelical Alliance, Edward Naville; it was published in the *Church Messenger* and the *Petersburg Gazette*, thus gaining an official character.
30. H. Dalton, *Offenes Sendschreiben an den Oberprokureur des russischen Synods Herrn Kirklichen Geheimrat Konstantin Pobedonoszeff* (Leipzig, 1889).
 31. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
 32. *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 57-58, 65-70.
 33. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, p. 237.
 34. *Rationalist* as used here and by Russian publicists signifies the rejection of ecclesiastical authority, and the claim that individuals may think out their own creed and interpret the scriptures without the aid of priest or church (F. C. Conybeare, *Russian Dissenters*, Vol. I of *Harvard Theological Studies* [Cambridge, 1921] p. 261).
 35. The Stundists received their name from the German word *Stunde*, derived from their hour-long meetings with Germans who read and discussed the Bible. Stundism was discovered in the late sixties and early seventies of the nineteenth century, in and around Odessa. It was a direct outcome of Western Protestantism, for Russians met with German Protestants and learned their ideas and quickly left the Orthodox church. Their main tenets were adopted from the Anabaptist and Mennonite sects. The Stundists had no fixed rites except that of breaking bread, but they read and discussed the Bible and sang hymns) (*Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, pp. 247-51; Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 451-54; Conybeare, pp. 331-35).
 36. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, pp. 247-51.
 37. See below, pp. 19-21.
 38. *Pisma*, II, 157 (June 23, 1887).
 39. S. M. Kravchinsky, *King Stork and King Log, A Study of Modern Russia* (London, 1896, 2 v.), I, 117-29.
 40. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, pp. 285-89.
 41. *Ibid.*, p. 249.
 42. K. P. Pobedonostsev, "Perepiska K. P. Pobedonostseva s preosvyashchennym Nikanorom episkopom Ufimskim," [Correspondence of K. P. Pobedonostsev with the Most Reverend Ufimsky Bishop Nikanor] *Russky Arkhiv* (1915) (hereafter cited as "Perepiska s Nikanorom"), IV, 463-64, 469; V, 106; VII, 338, 352, 355, 359, 361-63, 371, 373-74, 525 (1883-85).
 43. *Pisma*, II, 129 (January 21, 1887).
 44. Pobedonostsev, "Perepiska s Nikanorom," *Russky Arkhiv* (1915), VII, 359-60.
 45. *Ibid.*, p. 375.
 46. P. N. Milyukov, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi kultury* [Outlines of the History of Russian Culture] (Paris, 1931, 3 v.), II, 144.
 47. *Pisma*, II, 158-59 (July 30, 1887).
 48. *Ibid.*, p. 196 (August 31, 1888).
 49. *Ibid.*, I, 284 (May 10, 1880); Pobedonostsev, "Perepiska s Nikanorom," *Russky Arkhiv* (1915), V, 106; VII, 355; cf. Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 473.
 50. Pobedonostsev, "Perepiska s Nikanorom," *Russky Arkhiv* VII, 359-60; cf. Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 472-73.
 51. *Pisma*, II, 158-59.
 52. *Ibid.*, pp. 159-60, 163 (September 25, 1887), Milyukov, II, 144.
 53. Pobedonostsev, "Perepiska s Nikanorom," *Russky Arkhiv* (1915), VII, 355 (May 18, 1884); Biryukov, pp. 174-75, 495-509; Milyukov, I, 107.
 54. *Pisma*, II, 158 (July 30, 1887).
 55. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, p. 239; Conybeare, pp. 240-49; Milyukov, II, 153-56.
 56. Pobedonostsev, *Novum regnum*, pp. 580-82.
 57. *Pisma*, II, 316 (May 15, 1896).
 58. *Ibid.*, p. 155 (June 23, 1887).
 59. *Ibid.*
 60. *Ibid.*, p. 28 (March 23, 1883).
 61. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, p. 256.
 62. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
 63. *Pisma*, II, 102-104 (April 1, 1886).
 64. *Obzor deyatelnosti vedomstva pravoslavnago ispovedaniya*, p. 296.
 65. Leroy-Beaulieu, III, 340-46.
 66. Conybeare, p. 237.

SURVEYS

ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY

The sheer volume of production in studies of early church history at the present time means that this survey necessarily neglects many items which escape the surveyor's notice; he wishes to express his thanks to those who have sent him reprints of articles he might otherwise have missed.

A. Texts and Translations

J. Irmscher has described the current operations of the Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 78 (1953), 125-28. The *Clementine Homilies*, edited by B. Rehm, have now appeared, and work continues on the *Recognitions* and *Epitomai*, as well as on the *Apostolic Church Order* of Hippolytus, the gnostic papyrus Berlin 8502, and the index to Klostermann's edition of Origen on Matthew. In the latter series we may expect more of Athanasius, the *Præparatio* of Eusebius (half finished by K. Mras), and the *Homilies* of Macarius. Meanwhile F. Sagnard has produced the first-fruits of his edition of Irenaeus; it is a large volume in *Sources chrétiennes* containing the third book against heresies. He expects to bring forth the fourth and fifth books, then the first and second, then an *editio critica major*, then the *Epideixis*, and finally a new and complete "New Testament of St. Irenaeus." (There is now an excellent translation and commentary for the *Epideixis* in *Ancient Christian Writers*, the work of J. P. Smith of the Pontifical Biblical Institute.) In *Sources chrétiennes* we now have John Chrysostom *On the Incomprehensibility of God* (Cavallera—Daniélou, Flacelière), Origen on Numbers (Méhat), the first of Clement's *Stromata* (Mondésert—Caster), the first four books of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius (Bardy), and the *Epistle to Diognetus* (Marrou, dating it about 200). Werner Jaeger has published the text of Gregory of Nyssa's ascetical

works (Leiden, 1952). The first fascicle of the enormous *Corpus Christianorum* has appeared; it contains Tertullian *Ad martyras* (E. Dekkers) and *Ad nationes* (J. W. Ph. Borleffs). The classical scholar K. Ziegler has produced a new edition of Firmicus Maternus, along with a German translation.

An important collection of translations, edited by C. C. Richardson, is the volume *Early Christian Fathers* in the *Library of Christian Classics*. It contains the apostolic fathers, Justin (first apology), Athenagoras, and excerpts from Irenaeus, along with valuable introductory material. We should also mention E. Evans, *Saint Augustine's Enchiridion*, with translation, introduction and notes.

B. Studies of individual writers

P. Meinhold deals exhaustively with Polycarp and recent debates over the date of his martyrdom in the latest half-volume of Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. He favors the date of 155. A. Ehrhardt separates the two apologies of Justin in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953), 1-12. The present writer assigns a date shortly after 176 to Tatian's *Oration* in *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953), 99-101; this suggests, as he will try to prove, that Tatian was already a gnostic when he wrote. W. C. van Unnik finds an occasion for Pseudo-Justin's *Oratio* in the "crisis in education": *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 7 (1953), 129-42. W. Völker's elaborate *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* completes his trilogy, begun with Philo and Origen, on the development of Christian mysticism. Henry Chadwick has produced an invaluable translation with full introduction and notes of Origen's treatise *Contra Celsum*. His book could be listed under "translations" but it amounts to a full study because of the

notes. R. Leys has studied *L'image de Dieu chez saint Grégoire de Nysse*. Finally, recent literature on Augustine is fully discussed by P. Keseling, "Augustiniana," *Theologische Revue* 49 (1953), 81-98.

C. General Studies

A useful article by M. Simon in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953), 85-91, describes "Recent French Studies on Early Church History." Among general studies we may mention especially J. Leipoldt, *Der soziale Gedanke in der altchristlichen Kirche*; E. Giles, *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority A. D. 96-454*; and J. Ludwig, *Die Primatworte Mt. 16, 18, 19 in der altkirchlichen Exegese*. Closely related to the subject of primacy is O. Cullmann's highly important *Petrus, Jünger, Apostel, Märtyrer, das historische und das theologische Petrusproblem*, which has also appeared in French and will appear in English. Mention may perhaps be made of the present writer's *Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought*. (On the title page he is wrongly called professor of Theology.)

For the second century we have A. Benoit, *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle*, an excellent analysis, and the somewhat over-theological work of T. Rüschi, *Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*, which neglects (as Benoit also does) the importance of Tatian as a bridge between gnosticism and apologetic.

For the later period there is the provocative study of W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, which stresses non-theological factors almost to the exclusion of theology, and that of S. L. Greensdale, *Schism in the Early Church*, a general study which deals with the ancient causes and cures of schism with an eye on reunion today. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht have produced the second volume of their symposium, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, nearly a thousand pages of essays in German, French, English, and Spanish.

D. General Remarks

It may be worthwhile to say something about the "relevance" of the study of ancient church history. Too often, it seems to this surveyor, students of the early church are concerned with premature theological or historical conclusions, which they then find themselves compelled to defend. Adequate understanding of early Christianity demands full recognition of the many complex elements of human existence fifteen or twenty centuries ago; it demands recognition of the difference between ancient and modern presuppositions, and of the variety present in all human experience. In other words, before any of our knowledge of ancient Christianity can be used for modern theology, it must be analyzed as thoroughly and critically as possible, with at least relatively objective fidelity to the data we can obtain. If we simply project our own patterns on historical data we might as well not study history.

The relevance of historical studies is not a direct relevance. We do not live in the Roman Empire, and our situation today is at best only partly analogous to that of Christians then. It is the business of the historian to find not only analogous circumstances and common concerns but also those circumstances and concerns which are not analogous; he should try to explain how and why these similarities and differences came into existence. The historian, however, is not a theologian, technically speaking. He provides and analyzes information which the theologian can use, and he can sometimes suggest ways in which the theologian can use it. Unless he is concerned with providing and analyzing accurately, he will have led the theologian astray.

ROBERT M. GRANT

University of Chicago

E. SERIES AND BOOKS MENTIONED
Ancient Christian Writers, Westminster, Md.
Corpus Christianorum, Turnhout, (Belgium)

(Continued to next page)

JESUIT MISSIONS THROUGH THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

THE LITERATURE OF THE PAST DECADE

The past decade has brought forth a voluminous literature on the rise and development of the missions of the Society of Jesus down to the dissolution of the order in 1773. This was to have been expected of Jesuit scholarship, but a series of four hundredth anniversaries of Francis Xavier has stimulated research and writing,—that of his arrival in India in 1542, of his landing in Japan in 1549, and of his death on the China coast in 1552.

The continued preparation of definitive editions of the historical documents of the Society has aided studies

in Jesuit missions. Included within the vast *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* is a subseries entitled *Monumenta Missionum Societatis Jesu*. Volumes which have already appeared will be noted below.

Another project of monumental proportions, which will open an avenue for extensive study into Roman Catholic missions in the Orient, is in progress. During the fifteenth century the popes granted special rights in the Orient to Portugal. Then the decrees of 1493 and 1506 divided the territories newly discovered, or still to be discovered, between Spain and Portugal, and all rights of exploration, conquest, colonization, and missions were reserved to Portugal in the East. An office for the control of ecclesiastical affairs in the colonies and throughout Portugal's sphere of influence was created, called the Padroado. Missionaries of other than Portuguese nationality were desired to share in the evangelistic task, if they recognized the preeminent rights of Portugal and were subject to the Padroado. When the Spaniards sailed around Cape Horn and across the Pacific to the Philippines, they sought to extend their influence from that new base. Then it was that European rivalry became a source of confusion in Roman Catholic missions in the Orient. Eventually Portuguese power declined, but the Padroado still continued to claim control over all ecclesiastical affairs in the East, and it became a serious obstacle to vigorous missionary expansion until Rome finally substituted a system of vicariates general and prefectures apostolic for the regular diocesan organization. The archives of the Padroado and related documents, which must contain a fabulous wealth of material, are being collected, edited, annotated, and published by Antonio da Silva Rego at Goa under the title, *Documentacao para Historia das Missoes do Padroado Portugues do*

Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia

Sources chrétiennes, Paris

Benoit, A. *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle*, Paris, 1953

Chadwick, H. *Origen: Contra Celsum*, Cambridge, 1953

Cullmann, O. *Petrus, Jünger, Apostel, Märtyrer*, Zürich, 1952

Evans, E. *Saint Augustine's Enchiridion*, London, 1953

Freund, W. H. C. *The Donatist Church*, Oxford, 1952

Giles, E. *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority*, London, 1952

Grant, R. M. *Miracle and Natural Law*, Amsterdam, 1952

Greenslade, S. L. *Schism in the Early Church*, New York, 1953

Grillmeier, A.—Bacht, H. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon II.*, Würzburg, 1953

Leipoldt, J. *Der soziale Gedanke in der altchristlichen Kirche*, Leipzig, 1952

Leys, R. *L'image de Dieu chez saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Brussels, 1952

Ludwig, J. *Die Primatworte Mt. 16, 18. 19*, Münster, 1952

Rüsch, T. *Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*, Zürich, 1952

Völker, W. *Der wahre Gnostiker (Texte und Untersuchungen)*, Leipzig, 1952

(Continued on page 348)

Oriente.¹ Six volumes have been published, covering the eight years from 1500 to 1558. All orders and societies are included. The editor's competence has been highly praised.

An adequate survey of the whole Jesuit missionary enterprise, especially in relation to the total life and work of the Society, would be most welcome. *Jesuiten Zur See* by F. A. Plattner, translated under the title *Jesuits Go East*,² is a single volume attempt at a general survey, but it does not relate the mission to the total life and work of the Society. Its emphasis is upon the outreach of the order and upon the travel adventures of the missionaries. It gives a vivid sense of the cost of the mission in human terms and brings home to the reader most forcibly an understanding of the vast scope of the Jesuit mission.

Saint Francis Xavier

The Xavierian celebrations of the last ten years have called forth countless acts of devotion and gratitude to the great apostle to the Orient, but no other memorial offering excels the definitive new edition of the *Letters* of the missionary, to which Father George Schurhammer has devoted a lifetime of scholarship and in which he was later joined by Father Josef Wicki: the *Epistolae S. Francisci Xavierii*.³ The editors have discovered many letters not included in the earlier edition and they have recovered the text of many of the letters of the simple and forthright Basque saint from the pious, but unfortunate, emendations of earlier editors. Each item is provided with full bibliographical notes and textual history. Father Schurhammer also brought together his discoveries on Xavier's sojourn in Japan in a little booklet entitled *Der Heilige Franz Xaver in Japan*.⁴

It is hoped that the availability of a definitive text will inspire a competent translator to prepare an English version of a sufficiently comprehensive selection.⁵ Gräfin Vitzthum has made a new German translation of the *Letters*.⁶

One outstanding popular biography among several new efforts has been published. It is *Saint Francis Xavier* by James Brodrick, S.J.⁷ While written in a rather sprightly style, well seasoned with humor, it is based on the Schurhammer-Wicki research findings and on a thorough knowledge of the sources. It has behind it also the author's work on his five earlier books on Jesuit subjects.⁸ The Apostle to the Indies emerges from Brodrick's pages a living figure, a man of his day, a product of the Basque countryside, a great evangelist despite all his numerous limitations and sometimes unfortunate methods, a saint by God's grace despite his many failings. This book rescues an historical figure, a robust human being, and a passionate evangelist from four centuries of well-meaning, but unfortunate, hagiographical writing. A bibliography might well have been provided for the reader who might be led to further study, but one can be constructed from the full references in the numerous footnotes.

A review of recent research on Xavier will be found in an article by Josef Wicki, "Das Ergebnis der Neuesten Xaverius-Forschungen."⁹

India

Two volumes of the Society's *Documenta Indica*, edited by Josef Wicki, in the series, *Monumenta Missionum Societatis Jesu*, have appeared.¹⁰ Volume 1 (MHSJ, IV) covers the years 1540 to 1549 and Volume 2 (MHSJ, V), the years 1550 to 1553. The same high quality of scholarship manifested in the editing of Xavier's *Epistolae* is again found here, and valuable introductions and bibliographical sections precede the documents in each volume. The second volume of *The Jesuits in Malabar*, by Dominicus Ferrol, has been published in India,¹¹ but is marred by poor printing and many errors. It narrates in detail, against the political background and the work of other orders, Jesuit activity in southwest India from the middle of the seventeenth century to the suspension of the order.

Japan

The two most important recent con-

tributions to the illumination of the problems of the mission in Japan are not the work of Jesuits nor of church historians and they provide fresh points of view for a scrutiny of the subject. One of these is *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650* by Charles R. Boxer.¹² It will henceforth take the place of authority formerly held by James Murdock's *History of Japan During the Century of Early Foreign Intercourse*, published in 1903. Professor Boxer has made use of Portuguese and Japanese documents not available to Murdock and other writers, but he states that the Japanese material is of primary importance only for the period of proscription after 1633. An excellent bibliography is provided, and there is also a useful map showing places where Christians are known to have existed or were persecuted.

The descriptions and accounts of the Jesuit missionaries are extremely valuable to historians in general because they were the only Europeans who observed directly those events in the sixteenth century which marked the beginning of modern Japan. Arriving in the midst of feudal confusion, they saw the political unification of the country by Nobunaga, Hideyoshi, and Ieyasu. The missionaries were in sufficiently close relations with these men that their records are of outstanding value, more especially since on so many things the Japanese records are silent or untrustworthy. Moreover, these missionaries were keen and intelligent observers of Japanese life and culture, and they gave Europe a vivid picture of what was then the favorite mission field of the Jesuits and the one for which they had the greatest hope. Unfortunately for their European contemporaries, the editors in Portugal drastically abbreviated for publication their full and detailed reports.

Very weighty contributions from China and Japan had already been absorbed into the deeply rooted culture of Japan and thus a precedent set, which would make it appear that the Jesuit missionaries might be in a fa-

vorable position to introduce new ideas into the life of the islands. However, they were few in number and their residence in the land relatively short. Nevertheless, they made an earnest effort. The pen and press were their principal tools. Japanese converts admitted to the Society played an important part in the literary work, putting the missionaries' texts or ideas into acceptable form. Just as later in China, the missionaries introduced copperplate engraving and oil painting. A distinctive school of native art arose, and on this an interesting article has recently been written by Father Hubert Cieslik.¹³ As elsewhere, the Jesuits demonstrated their remarkable ability for adaptation, and the general policy and methods for this were laid down by Valignano. Led by him, the missionaries assumed the status and quality of Zen priests, conformed to Japanese etiquette in all social forms, built and furnished their homes in native style, and wore Japanese dress. Aiming at the conversion of the nation through winning the upper classes, they were in all their dealings with the nobles and gentry zealous to show behavior which would win confidence. Attention was given to the lower classes principally when they became Christian at the command of their feudal lords. Part of the effectiveness of this method of approach is found in the astounding number of converts, some 300,000 by 1615. When Spanish Franciscans entered Japan from the Philippines, they attacked the Jesuit attempts at adaptation, stressing the traditional European religious dress and customs. They also turned to the poor people of the cities and made hospital work their chief method of approach.¹⁴ The Franciscans were also irked by the profitable silk trade carried on by the Jesuits. Boxer believes that this unfortunate rivalry between the orders was a prime cause of the ruin of both missions. Supported by their trade in silk, the Jesuits did not train their converts adequately in support of the Church.

Three factors weakened the stand-

ing of the Jesuits with the rulers. The entrance of the Dutch merchants into trade with Japan ended the Portuguese monopoly and made commercial relations with Macao no longer completely essential to the Japanese. The missionaries, moreover, had trained a sufficient number of Japanese in a knowledge of the Portuguese language so that officials were no longer dependent upon the Jesuits as interpreters. Then, further, an incident occurred which seemed to substantiate the charge made by Buddhists that Japanese Christians were becoming a kind of "fifth column" of subversive agents. This was the famous statement attributed to the pilot of the *San Felipe* that missionaries were used by the Spanish king as advance agents preparatory to conquest of a new region. Although he points out some discrepancies, Professor Boxer follows the Jesuit account in general. Fortunately for us, Johannes Laures has recently made a very thorough study of this question, and in light of his research it appears very probable that the unfortunate pilot had not the slightest intention of making so damning a statement, but was tricked by the examining Japanese officer into giving apparent assent to the charge.¹⁵

Boxer traces carefully the decline of the mission from the first instance of Hideyoshi's hostility through proscription and persecution to the closing of the country against the West.¹⁶ He states: "But for the introduction, growth, and forcible suppression of militant Christianity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it seems probable that Tokugawa Japan would not have retired into its isolationist shell." Had this not occurred, the Japanese would probably have established themselves in the Philippines, Indo-China, and Indonesia by the end of the seventeenth century.

Professor Boxer's book probably introduces to most of its readers for the first time that great missionary administrator, Alessandro Valignano. The author is interested in Valignano's policy of adaptation, as mentioned above, and in his advocacy of recruit-

ing and training a native clergy, which seemed to him the only means of providing sufficient manpower for the mission. Valignano believed that the Japanese possess the qualities required for the priesthood and championed this view despite the prevailing Portuguese contempt for Asiatic peoples and the diametrically opposite views of Cabral and other missionaries. In the long run, the Jesuits proved to be reluctant to admit many Japanese to the priesthood and kept most of them in the ranks of lay brothers and catechists. That their faith was strong was proven by the martyrdom of many of them.

Critical editions of Valignano's *Historia* and theoretical work on adaptation were published within the past decade,¹⁷ and Josef Franz Schütte, S. J., has brought out Part 1 of the first of a projected three volume work entitled *Valignanos Missionsgrundsätze für Japan*.¹⁸ In addition to more than four hundred of Valignano's own writings, Father Schütte has gathered a vast array of other sources. As Visitor or Inspector of the missions, Valignano advocated and sought to provide colleges for the continuous nourishing of the spiritual life of the Society and for systematic study of the languages and indigenous customs of the oriental countries. He strove also to recruit and train an indigenous clergy and thus enlarge the scope and activity of the mission. He tried also to promote the financial security of the mission by improving Japanese-Portuguese trade and securing a share of it for the mission. When Schütte's work has been completed, we can expect to have an adequate knowledge of this preeminent mission theoretician and administrator.

The second of the two books to which reference was made at the beginning of this section is *The Western World and Japan* by Sir George Sansom.¹⁹ There are two parts to this highly significant book. The second and longer part presents an excellent description of the traditional Japanese culture of the Tokugawa period, analyzes the transformation of society in

the second half of the nineteenth century, and arrives at the conclusion that Japanese culture has changed only superficially while its inner life and thought have remained essentially impervious to western influence. This is presented in support of the thesis of Part I, "Europe and Asia": a society can decay and renew itself without changing its essence and without radical modification by outside influences. Sansom's view is that the civilizations of Asia possess a unity among themselves which sets them sharply and distinctly apart from western culture. While they may change superficially to a small degree under western impact, voluntarily selecting certain western ways, such as economic patterns or technological processes, they never really surrender to the West in the essential features of political, social, and religious life. With this theory in mind, Sansom reviews the earlier cultural contacts between Europe and East Asia, particularly Japan.

The author has made full use of contemporary documents in his study of Christianity in Japan from 1549 to 1614 and he regards Father Luis Frois' *Historia do Japao* as the most reliable single source. Sir George treats the Jesuit missionaries sympathetically and fairly. While he does not question their evangelistic motive, he questions their attitudes and methods. Despite their strong tendency to adopt Japanese customs, he believes that they failed to comprehend fully the political situation, the nature of Buddhism, and the strength of indigenous beliefs and customs. Consequently, they needlessly offended Japanese sentiment. He thinks their most serious mistake to have been the lack of proper allowance for the strong family feeling expressed in ancestral rites, erroneously regarded as worship. Intolerance and misrepresentation of Buddhism needlessly antagonized the powerful Buddhist priesthood. Yet, it is not to be denied that during the period of the Jesuit mission Christianity made a stronger appeal to the Japanese than to other highly cultured Asiatic peoples, and Sansom says

that "there is perhaps a clue in the resemblance between the ecstatic states of mind reached by Japanese Christians and those enjoyed by devotees of the Pure Land and Lotus sects, which are both distinctly Japanese versions of Buddhism." He does not believe that the Christian Gospel can ever win Asia. On the basis of the Jesuit mission in India, China, and Japan, he considers that Christianity has had little influence on the culture of those countries and asserts that "it is only upon peoples whose aboriginal civilization was backward that western religious thought has left a permanent mark." The Filipinos are a case in point, but the predominant influence of Christianity among them may not be expected to be repeated in Japan, China, or India. There is certainly not as great cultural unity in Asia as Sansom believes; he does not review the entire history of the mission; and he takes no account of the recent spread in Asia of a western ideology, Communism. However, the views of this outstanding authority on Japanese history and culture present a forceful challenge to many assumptions underlying the mission.

China

Within a relatively few years after Francis Xavier died in 1552 while waiting on an island off the southern coast for transportation to the mainland, the Jesuits succeeded in establishing a mission in China. The mission was originally established at the Portuguese trading center of Macao, but Ruggieri succeeded in entering China itself, and Matteo Ricci reached Peking in 1601. No remnant of the medieval Franciscan mission remained, but from Ricci's time onward Roman Catholic Christianity has continued in China.

Ricci's own account is the chief source for the beginning of the mission, and we are indebted to Professor Pasquale M. D'Elia of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome for a new and definitive edition. This collection of documents by and about Ricci and the mission will cover the

years from 1579 to 1615. This important work is entitled *Fonti Ricciane; Documenti Originali Concernenti Matteo Ricci e la Storia delle Prime Relazioni tra l'Europa e la Cina*. The first three volumes, now published, contain the *Storia dell' Introduzione del Cristianesimo in Cina*.²⁰ The original manuscript had been translated into Latin and published in 1615 and then was lost for three hundred years. It was discovered and published in a defective edition in 1911. An English translation of the introductory portion on China and the Chinese was made by L. J. Gallagher from the Trigault Latin version of 1615.²¹ Father D'Elia's introduction to the work of Ricci forms in itself a significant contribution. It includes chapters on Chinese religious thought, the Nestorian mission, the medieval Franciscan mission, the Jesuit mission up to the beginning of Ricci's work, and then an account of the China mission under Ricci. The text is found in Volumes 1 and 2, while Volume 3 contains valuable appendices and indices.

The Jesuits in China followed an even more thoroughgoing policy of adaptation of the national culture than in Japan, and Confucianism, which they regarded as a philosophy and not a religion, was looked upon as a preparation for the Gospel. There is, however, no justification for Outerbridge's assertion²² that the policy in Peking was so radically different from that of the Society of Jesus in general. The Peking missionaries, indeed, showed an appreciation of the Chinese character similar to that of Valignano for the Japanese and seemed to lack the nationalistic pride of some of their brethren at Macao, but their policy of adaptation was in essence, though greater in degree, the same as that of the brethren in Japan and of Di Nobili in India. Christian terminology, teachings, and rites were also adapted to Confucian thought and practice as far as possible. Since a sharp break with tradition was not required, the upper classes, including officials and the literati, responded readily. The

successive heads of the mission were able mathematicians and astronomers and they were placed in charge of the imperial bureau of astronomy. The Emperor K'ang Hsi favored them and a decree of toleration was issued in 1692. The story has been well told by Arnold H. Rowbotham in *Missionary and Mandarin, the Jesuits at the Court of China*.²³ A Chinese scholar has produced a dissertation in Latin at Rome on the effort to produce and introduce a Chinese liturgy.²⁴

Other orders entered China and shared in the success of the Jesuits, but, unfortunately, Portuguese-Spanish rivalry and interorder suspicion introduced controversy and confusion **more violent than in Japan**. The critics of the Jesuit missionaries centered their attacks on the policy of adaptation and the disastrous "Rites Controversy" followed. The argument reached a degree of violence in Europe greater than that in China. Decisions by the Propaganda, and then by the Pope, prohibited the Jesuit practices, and after 1715 all missionaries to China were required to take a special oath to abide by the decrees. This cut the root of the Jesuit system of evangelism, for henceforth no person in an official position (and thus required to participate in the state rites) could be a member of the Church. Moreover, the Emperor was offended by the pretensions of foreigners to change the age-old customs of his people and to question his own understanding of propriety, and he no longer favored the missionaries. Then persecution replaced imperial patronage. A profusely documented article on the Peking mission at the time of the judgment against the Jesuit practices lists the sources for that critical period: "*La Mission de Pékin a la Veille de la Condamnation des Rites*" by Joseph Dehergne, S.J.²⁵ After the suspension of the Jesuits, the Peking mission was entrusted to the Lazarists, but the foreign mission was placed under more and more heavy pressure until persecution eliminated the missionaries, decimated the native priests, and cut off the Church in China from

contact with the outside world. Yet the Church survived, although sadly reduced in numbers, until the resumption of the mission in the nineteenth century.

The Americas

The Jesuit mission in Canada has not attracted as much attention recently as the enterprise in the Orient. Father Francis Xavier Talbot, who had earlier written a life of Isaac Jogues, has contributed another biography, *Saint Among the Hurons: The Life of Jean de Brébeuf*,²⁶ martyred by the Iroquois at the time of their destruction of the Huron nation. Perhaps the most interesting recent book relative to the Canadian mission is *Jesuit and Savage in New France* by J. H. Kennedy.²⁷ A by-product of the mission was the interpretation of the Indian given to Europe by the missionaries, and this book is concerned with the development of the idea of the "savage" from the "physical reality in New France." The writings of the missionaries stimulated the growth of the concept of "the noble savage," simple and good, and provided the political philosophers with an idea of which they made much use in their effort to reform society. Again and again, in the case of India, Japan, China, and the new world, the missionaries of the Society of Jesus were instrumental in interpreting new cultures to Europeans and, consequently, stimulated intellectual life in the West. The writer analyzes the work of the missionaries, their motives as well as those of their sponsors and friends, their attitudes and their achievements. He investigates carefully the description of the Indian culture given by the missionaries and compares that description with the actual situation. He writes: "In his natural state the Indian seemed to be capable at once of both nobility and abysmal depravity. Out of his strange customs the missionaries collected a miscellany of virtues and vices. When vice appeared to predominate, they insisted that the appearance belied the reality, and for this conviction many of them paid with their lives." Apparently the mis-

sionaries were not as objective observers in the American forests as in the cities of the Orient. Despite all his noble virtues, the missionaries declared that the American savage needed the Christian faith in order for him to attain fully the possibilities of his moral nature.

The Society of Jesus had not yet come into being when the Franciscan and Dominican missionaries began to accompany the explorers and conquistadors in Spanish America. When they arrived they found some territories, either remote or by-passed by others, still in a pioneering stage of missionary effort. A collection of letters of Jesuit missionaries in Mexico has been published.²⁸ Most noteworthy are four monographs by Peter Masten Dunne: *Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast*, *Pioneer Jesuits in Northern Mexico*, *Early Jesuit Missions in Tarahumara*, and *Black Robes in Lower California*.²⁹ The first treats of the founding of the mission stations on the Sinola River on the west coast of Mexico in 1591 and the story of the following forty years. The second takes up the tale of the mission east of the Sierra Madre Occidental range in Durango and Coahuila. The third narrates the progress of the mission in present-day Chihuahua, and the fourth and most recent gives the story of the Jesuit enterprise in the long, narrow peninsula of Lower California between 1697 and 1768.

There is little to report about other areas. Africa was not the scene of extensive missionary activity in the centuries under consideration. The Jesuits attempted a mission on the Zambesi River in 1560, but it failed. Their mission to Abyssinia in that same century was directed towards bringing the Ethiopian Church into conformity with, and submission to, Rome rather than in converting pagans or Muslims. An interesting account of this effort is the chapter entitled "Prester John's Business" in *The Progress of the Jesuits* by James Brodrick.³⁰

R. PIERCE BEAVER
Missionary Research Library

1. Silva Rego, Antonio da, ed. *Documentacao para Historia das Missoes do Padroado Portugues do Oriente*, Vols. 1-6. Goa, 1949-1951.
2. Plattner, F. A. *Jesuiten zur See*. Zürich, Atlantis Verlag, 1946. Translated under title, *Jesuits Go East*, by Lord Sudley and Oscar Blobel. Dublin, Clonmore and Reynolds, 1950.
3. Schurhammer, G., et Wicki, I., ed. *Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii aliaque Eius Scripta, Nova Editio ex Integro Refecta*. 2 vols. (*Monumenta Societatis Jesu*, Tom. I and II; *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*, Tom. LXVII, LXVIII.) Rome, Mon. Hist. Soc. Jesu, 1944, 1945.
4. Schriftenreihe der Neuen Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft, No. I. Schöneck/Beckenried, 1947.
5. Some good English translation by David Macdonald from the earlier edition in *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* are to be found in Robertson, Edith Anne (Stewart), *The Life of St. Francis Xavier, Evangelist, Explorer, Mystic*. [London], Headley, 1917.
6. *Briefe des S. Francisco Xavier, 1542-1552*. München, Kösel-Verlag, [1950].
7. Brodrick, James. *Saint Francis Xavier*. New York, Wicklow Press, 1952.
8. *The Life and Work of St. Robert Bellarmine; The Economic Morals of the Jesuits; Frederick Ozanam; The Origin of the Jesuits; and The Progress of the Jesuits*.
9. *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 36 (1952), Heft 4, pp. 299-306.
10. Rome, Mon. Hist. Soc. Jesu, 1948, 1950.
11. Bangalore, 1951.
12. Berkeley, University of California Press; London, Cambridge University Press; 1951.
13. Cieslik, Hubert, S. J. "Kirishitan Kunst," in *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, Vol. VIII [1952], Heft 2, pp. 96-104; Heft 3, pp. 161-177.
14. See Schilling, Dorotheus, *Hospitäl der Franziskaner in Miyako, 1594-1597*. Schöneck/Beckenried, *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, 1950. (Schriftenreihe der NZM, No. 9, reprinted from NZM, Vols. V and VI)
15. Laures, Johannes, S. J. "Kritische Untersuchung des berühmten Lotsenwortes der 'San Felipe,'" in *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, Vol. VII (1951), Heft 3, pp. 184-203. Father Laures is the author of several earlier monographs in the Monumenta Nipponica Series and attention should be called to his *Nobunaga und das Christentum*, Monograph No. 10 in the series, Tokyo, Sophia University, 1950.
16. For a recent account of the suppression of Christianity, see Cieslik, Hubert, S. J., "Das Christen-Verbot in Japan unter dem Tokugawa Regime," in *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, Vol. VI (1950), Heft 3, pp. 175-192; Heft 4, pp. 256-272; Vol. VII (1951), Heft 1, pp. 24-36.
17. a) Valignano, Alessandro, *Historia del Principio y Progreso de la Compania de Jesus en las Indias Orientales, 1542-1564*, edited by Josef Wicki, Rome, 1944; b) *Il Ceremoniale per i Missionari del Giappone*, ed. by G. F. Schütte, S. J., Rome, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1946.
18. I. Band: Von der Ernennung zum Visitator bis zum ersten Abschied von Japan (1573-1582), I. Teil: Das Problem (1573-1580). Rome, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1951.
15. New York, Knopf, 1950.
20. Rome, La Libreria dello Stato, Vol. I, 1942; Vols. II and III, 1949.
21. *The China That Was: First Book of the Expedition to China Undertaken by the Society of Jesus*. Milwaukee, Bruce, [1942].
22. Outerbridge, Leonard M. *The Lost Churches of China*. Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1952. See Chapter IV, "Missionary Mandarins," pp. 67-96, for a brief, appreciative account of the Jesuit mission.
23. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1942.
24. Chen, Stanislaus. *Historia Tentaminum Missionarium Societatis Jesu pro Liturgia Sinica in Saeculo XVII*. Rome, Pont. Univers. Urbanianum de Prop. Fide, 1951.
25. *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, Vol. IX (1953), Heft 2, pp. 91-106.
26. New York, Harper, 1949. See also Latourelle, K., *Études sur les Ecrits de Saint Jean de Brébut*, Vol. I, Montreal, Faculté de Philosophie et Théologie de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1952.
27. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950 (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany L).
28. *Relacion Breve de la Venida de los de la Compania de Jesus a la Nueva Espana, Año de 1602*. Manuscrito anonimo del Archivo Historico de la Secretaria de Hacienda, Version paleografica del original, prologo, notas y adiciones por Francesco Gonzales de Cossio. Mexico, Imprenta Universitaria, 1945.
29. All published at Berkeley by the University of California Press, 1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, respectively.
30. London, Longmans Green, 1946, pp. 233-264.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOHN T. McNEILL, *A History of the Cure of Souls*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951, xii and 371 pp. \$5.

Primitive Christianity had offered another age of anxiety a missionary doctor, who would by his exorcism and charisma cure strange diseases vainly treated by more physical doctors, trained in less spiritual doctrines. Karl Holl, in his essay on "Die Missionsmethode der alten und der mittelalterlichen Kirche," notices how important the competition over the cure of souls was from the earliest moments of church history. "Surprisingly," he writes, "the early church from the beginning had an office which we have established only in recent times: the mission doctor. Certainly the mission doctor of that time was no such sober figure as is the modern doctor. But the range of activities which Christian exorcists and charismatics . . . engaged in was quite large. They practiced not only among Christians, but also among the heathen and even the Jews. . . . The Christian exorcists knew how to heal even the most severe cases, cases which Jewish and pagan exorcists had tried in vain. The trend of the time, in which anxious care for one's body played such a large part, met this very activity of the church halfway and with special eagerness."

Now again, Jewish and pagan exorcists are competing with Christian in the cure of souls; and perhaps more successfully than ever before. Sigmund Freud is only the greatest name marking the challenge to the Christian therapeutic tradition. That tradition has suffered a certain oblivion among Christians themselves. Professor McNeill has taken an exemplary Protestant measure, in order to help right the balance in contemporary competition over the cure of souls. He has

written *A History of the Cure of Souls*, "to introduce to a wider class of readers a province of history of which there exists no other general treatment."

The treatment, then, is history. In the Protestant tradition, the abuses of the present have been cured first by presenting the uses of the past. Professor McNeill has been driven by his knowledge of that sickness, especially affecting modern Protestantism, which he calls the "obsession with the contemporary" to try the therapy of history on the problem of the cure of souls itself. He has written a much needed history of *religio psychiatri*, as a prophylactic against that "new and strange phenomenon . . . a scientific psychiatry indifferent to religion and philosophy." His history is offered as a medicament, to put scientific psychiatry back "in something like its true historical perspective," and to humble the secular healer with "an invigorating awareness of his membership in a unique and sacred profession that spans the centuries."

But the past is precisely what the scientific doctor of souls must seek to abort. Modern psychotherapy, in all its significant expressions, is not indifferent to religion and philosophy as such; only to Christian religion and to a philosophy still concerned with proposing that there are ends of man beyond life itself. Indeed, Freud viewed his new science as the inheritor of the declining authority of the Christian churches. "Psychoanalysis is a re-education," Freud declared. The scientific psychotherapy is not less a moral therapy than the earlier forms Professor McNeill reviews in this book. Scientific psychiatry is certainly aware of its religious predecessors. Freud at least pays Christian moral pedagogy the compliment of noticing the effects of its decline. Neurosis waxes, Freud writes, as religion

wanes. He cited the "extraordinary increase in the neuroses since the power of religion had waned" to give his physicians some indication of "the intensity of man's inner irresolution and craving for authority."

Freud thought he saw certain resemblances between certain methods of the old cure of souls and the new. Particularly, "the Confessional . . . which the Catholic church has employed for centuries to wield her influence over her communicants . . . may be considered as belonging in the realm of psychoanalysis." The Confessional, as a method of spiritual guidance, seemed to Freud a "leading up to (psychoanalysis), as it were." In fact, religious guidance in general seemed to this central figure of scientific psychiatry now only of "historical value." The religious cure of souls had exhausted its authority. The spiritual advisor of the churches would be replaced by quite another kind of physician, a "secular spiritual guide." In a famous passage, Freud concluded: "Indeed, these words, 'a secular spiritual guide,' might well serve as a general formula for describing the function which the analyst, whether he is a doctor or a layman, [Freud did not expect his best moral physicians to be doctors of the body as well] has to perform in his relation to the public."

After he had laid down his general formula for the new moral physician, Freud went on to attack the old. Both the Protestant and Catholic moral physicians only offered their sick relief "by confirming their faith." The offer may indeed be successful for a time, but precisely because they must confirm the old faith Christian ministers can afford at best a very temporary relief. Christianity is, for scientific psychiatry, itself an expression of the sickness that plagues the world, not a cure. Any relief a pastor can bring is only the passing flush that comes over the soul on first being received back into any community after the sickness of alienation that characterizes the "social dilemma" of being neurotic. The scientific moral physi-

cian, on the other hand, cannot "seek to bring [man] relief by receiving him back into the Catholic, Protestant or socialist community." Scientific psychiatry (the phrase is Professor McNeill's, not the reviewer's), whatever the protestations of leaders like Karl Menninger and Erich Fromm, must aim to free men from their sick communities. It is precisely in a total critique of Christian belief that Freud located "spiritual guidance in the best sense of the words."

It may be argued that Freud's epigones were less intransigent against the religious cure of souls than Freud himself. Professor McNeill's favorite scientific psychiatrist seems to be Otto Rank. But it is no surprise to discover that Rank, too, considered that since "psychoanalytic knowledge . . . is knowledge of mankind" a new kind of pastor, far more powerful than the old, had come into the world. With the psychiatrist performing his new pastoral functions, Rank writes, "the old family physician, the friend and counselor of the family, would thus again play his former role with an even deeper meaning. He would watch with understanding and know intimately the whole personality and would be able to exert an intelligent influence upon the development of a human being from his birth onwards, on his education, to throw some light on the difficulties of puberty and the choice of a profession, and on marriage, all more or less trying mental conflicts, as well as to deal with organic illness and mental disorders." As scientific psychiatry conceives its inheritance of the "role of counselor," it would by no means "be restricted to bodily ailments" but to all the ailments of the soul and of the body politic. "This doctor of souls," Rank proclaims, "would naturally exert through the family a still unconceived amount of influence upon society, its morals and its customs and thus indirectly effect an improvement in education and in this way contribute to the prophylaxis of the neurosis." The scientific moral physician would unite in his own person all the knowledge

"which has up to now appeared to be so heterogeneous" and so "contribute towards the unification of the sciences in general, which up to now have been too sharply separated into the natural and the mental (e.g., cultural) sciences." All that was needed for a great new effort at the cure of souls was a dedicated army of psychiatrically trained missionaries. Another of Freud's epigones, Ferenczi, considered the necessity of training a whole "army" of disciples in right doctrine: not only practicing analysts, but teachers of all sorts, criminologists, social workers—in fact, everyone "whose work, in one way or another, has any bearing on the human soul." Freud himself dreamed of psychoanalytic colleges, to train the new missionaries, "an ideal scheme, no doubt. . . . But an ideal which can and must be realized." He anticipated the cynicism with which his missionary demand would be received. It is true, he admitted, he wanted "some sort of a new Salvation Army." And then he directly challenged the older armies of salvation: "why not?" Other missionary movements had thought they knew the right way to salvation. "After all," Freud concluded, "our fantasy always follows existing patterns."

Professor McNeill is certain that "the role of the religious physician of souls is not played out." But he does not consider that this role may be renewed under quite another doctrine and in another institutional form. It is the specific weakness of Protestant intellectuals concerned with the problem of the cure of souls that they still believe, with Professor McNeill, that the scientific psychiatrist can be "an ally of the pastoral advisor"; indeed, he can. But the psychiatrist can be as well an ally of any other kind of advisor, and this should limit the possibilities of any alliance to a Christian pastorate. Psychiatry can serve any master. It is peculiarly liable to serve the modern state. But, despite the program, doctrine and political alliances of the new science, (the psychiatrist has a connection with armies and with warfare to which the pastor can never

aspire) Professor McNeill sees no reason why there should not be an "effective correlation of religious and scientific psychotherapy." He quotes with favor David E. Roberts' suggestion that "theologians incorporate the therapist's conception of conflict in the doctrine of sin and his conception of healing in the doctrine of grace." It would be strange to see such radical secularizations accepted into theology. Such hopes for incorporation show a terrible failure to understand either the doctrines or the program of scientific psychotherapy, as a challenge to the cure of souls. Professor McNeill's assumption that "the solution of the tension between them will come by mutual recognition and not by the extinction of either" ignores the threat of extinction to a declining therapy inherent in the process of "mutual recognition." The Christian cure of souls must be bankrupt if it needs to hope for so much from its competitor.

Professor McNeill's fine history is thus somewhat vitiated by his failure to see the historic character of the present struggle to define the health of man; nevertheless, it is fine history. His book shows some of the rarer virtues of the historian's art. Knowing that he can "merely glance . . . at the problems and mysteries that are attracting new attention in our century," Professor McNeill has compensated for the necessary quality of survey in the book by forcing the intellectual virtue of an adequate survey—perspective. He has put the wise men, the scribes, the rabbis of Israel, of his chapter one, in the same perspective with the curates of the modern Anglican communion, the Lutherans, the Quakers, the great religious movements of Asia, the philosophic medicine of the Greeks, with the whole range of the Christian divisions and the radical secularizations of the contemporary science of the soul. The cures have remained remarkably stable, through all the changes of culture and denomination, and Professor McNeill takes notice of this essential fact.

In a volume covering such a tre-

mendous amount of data, the author might have exposed his readers to the German disease; but there are almost no footnotes in this book. Professor McNeill has simply listed the books and articles he has consulted and left the general reader free of an apparatus he does not want at the same time that the specialist is freed from the distraction of an over-documentation he does not need. The erudition never obtrudes; its massiveness surprises the reader when he becomes aware of it. Professor McNeill is particularly insightful in the chapter from which the book really germinated, on the Celtic penitential discipline. The seeds of the romantic movement, in both religion and literature, are laid out freshly, from a point of origin little known to students of romanticism. Professor McNeill has the final, moral virtue of the historian, without which church history becomes foolish and loses its didactic purpose; he is not neutral. His value judgments, positive and negative, fall regularly upon his subjects. These judgments are deeply Protestant. Professor McNeill's book emphasizes the danger, which has manifested itself in forms more Roman than Catholic, of that "perverse and overbearing spiritual direction in which one person's will and conscience are yielded to another's."

PHILIP RIEFF

Brandeis University

Das Ende des Gesetzes. By GÜNTHER BORNKAMM. München. Chr. Kaiser, 1952. Pp. 210. DM 11.80.

This is a collection of essays and sermon-meditations on various "essential problems of Pauline theology." Five deal with Romans, two with I Corinthians, one each with Galatians and Colossians, and three with "Christ and the World in the Early Christian Message," "Man and God in Greek Tragedy and in the Early Christian Message," and "The Question of the Justice of God." Most of them are acute philological-theological studies

relating the style of Paul's letters to his theological thought. Perhaps the most interesting to readers of *Church History* are the following arguments: (1) Romans 7 is a description of man in general, under the law and sin; (2) there is a sharp contrast between I Corinthians 13 and all possible Greek models; (3) "anathema" is an early Christian formula of exclusion from the eucharist; and (4) the Colossian heresy is related to the later Hypsistarii and syncretistic Diaspora-Judaism, closely bound up with gnostic ideas.

ROBERT M. GRANT

University of Chicago.

The Medieval Latin Hymn. RUTH ELLIS MESSENGER. Washington, D. C.: Capital Press, 1953. 138 pages. \$3.25.

A popularly written, brief discussion of medieval Latin hymnody "from the point of view of usage," Miss Messenger's book fills the need for a summary of our present knowledge about the subject. Adequately documented, providing a useful bibliography, and appending seventeen well-selected illustrative hymns in the original and in translation, the volume, although unnecessarily compact, should have a sale far beyond the limits of groups professionally interested in liturgy, Latin literature, or church history.

Miss Messenger quite properly stresses the extra-liturgical processional hymns as having an importance equal to that of the hymns of the Divine Office and the sequences of the Mass. In fact, this emphasis seems to be her peculiar contribution to the study of medieval hymnody. To it she devotes her most significant chapter (the sixth). Otherwise her book contains nothing new or striking.

Remarkably free of misprints (I found only one), the volume has several disagreeable evidences of *lapsus memoriae*. On p. 31 the reference to "Roman persecution in the Iberian peninsula" should no doubt read "Muslim persecution." Contrary to

the lines on pp. 39 f., it is known (according to Notker's own statement as well as Miss Messenger's on p. 41) that Notker was not the first to invent "words as an aid in memorizing the elaborate melody of the *alleluia* trope." Moreover, Notker, if born *ca.* 840, could not have been "a teacher of the music school in the period of Louis the Pious" (p. 41), since the emperor died that very year. In several instances Miss Messenger might have chosen to reproduce better translations of the hymns.

The chief value of the book is perhaps twofold. For students, it lies in the extensive bibliography. For general readers, it lies in its brevity and clarity.

ALLEN CABANISS

University, Mississippi.

Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy: The Historical Roots of a Modern Problem. By CATHERINE E. BOYD. Published for the American Historical Association. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1952, 280 pages. \$4.00.

The scope and method of this book derive, in part, from the deeply rooted history of the *decima* as it has survived into modern times. They follow, even more, from the author's confessed predilection for a ranginess of subject sufficient "to satisfy the need for philosophical insight and to give full scope to the type of historical scholarship which cannot rest satisfied when it has established a body of scientifically ascertained facts but must see those facts in their total context of relationships" (ix). The result is much more an occasion for congratulation than for regret. It is a happy example of post-doctoral studies wisely fostered under learned auspices and given a distinguished publication outlet. The research product is in every major particular a credit to the best traditions of international scholarship. The bold coverage of an extended chronology in social-religious articulation with the institutions of temporal and spiritual power enables us to see

the church in an increasingly realistic light.

To study the tithe is to view the economic and religious embarrassment of modern Italy; it is also to probe back into the origins of the church's *tenth* and to labor forward with the staggering accretion of complexities attending the evolution of this "well-nigh universal income tax." A better illustration than this could scarcely be found for demonstrating the church's involvements in feudal society; its stake in the intricacies of Roman and ecclesiastical law; its relation to the subtleties of the monastic spirit; and its papal, hierarchical, and parochial investment in the emergence of town life. To follow the kaleidoscopic ramifications of the ecclesiastical tithe is to look afresh at virtually every aspect of the medieval Italian parish, to review the feudalization of the regular and secular clergy, to reinterpret simoniacal heresy and canonical reform in its Hildebrandine setting, to ferret out the acerbated conflicts between the Italian episcopate and the rebellious communes. All of this the author does—and more.

This is not a popular work in the usual sense; nor is one here called for. Written, moreover, with scholarly dignity and literary verve, it prompts nostalgic memories of a time when scholarly footnotes and supporting apparatus were deemed, not excess baggage, but a priceless resource. The footnotes to the chapter on the Gregorian Reform, for example, show a characteristic alertness to both the older and more recent monographs, periodical literature, and key documents in the field of ecclesiastical history. The brief appendix on the literature of the "Eigenkirche" is trenchantly selective. A ready conversance with the issues of canon law and a reasonable sympathy with the church's struggle to maintain spiritual ideals in a rough age of brutally applied pressures is usually apparent in the author's treatment.

This reviewer recognizes, with appreciation, Miss Boyd's balanced analysis and evaluation of monastic institutions, for instance, with which he

has considerable acquaintance. He defers gratefully and with confidence, therefore, to what impresses him as the author's clear and measured insights into many areas beyond his critical competence. Fellow specialists in closer proximity to Prof. Boyd's field than the reviewer will doubtless subject her to salutary criticism at some points. At this juncture, it is perhaps more pertinent to pay tribute on the part of church historians, generally, for her capable and inspiring service. Hers is a methodology that does not cajole modern interest for medieval studies but rather compels it with evidences of undeniable pertinence. Her book does, indeed, "demonstrate that the study of medieval institutions may have a vital relevance to problems of the present" (240).

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University.

The Grey Friars in Cambridge, 1225-1538, By JOHN R. H. MOORMAN. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. viii, 277 pages. \$7.00.

Although Dr. A. G. Little, the distinguished authority on English *Franciscana*, wrote his *Grey Friars in Oxford* some sixty years ago, no comparable work on the Minorites in the younger university has hitherto been undertaken, perhaps because the Cambridge Franciscans had no such brilliant stars in their firmament as adorned Oxford in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. (It appears likely, however, that Duns Scotus spent a few years in the Cambridge friary around 1300.)

Dr. Moorman, who has since earned wide acclaim as a medievalist, first turned his attention to the subject a quarter of a century ago. The volume before us, a masterpiece of meticulous research, is an expansion of Birkbeck Lectures delivered at Cambridge in 1948-49.

When the Franciscans arrived at the then infant university, probably in 1225, they came, as Dr. Moorman reminds us, not in pursuit of learning,

but in the hope of gaining recruits from among the students. Their first home, 'the house of Benjamin the Jew,' they shared awhile with the town jail. After about forty years they acquired a more spacious friary on the site now occupied by Sidney Sussex College. Presently, "out of the collapse of the original Franciscan vision there arose a new ideal, an alliance of poverty and learning, which was to give a fresh vigor to the Order and to have a deep influence on the intellectual movements of the day." From far and wide the Grey Friars of Cambridge drew their teachers, some of them not undistinguished. This competition aroused the hostility of the secular masters, with resulting strains and tensions. Moorman points out that the Franciscans expected to share fully in the privileges of the academic community while stoutly maintaining their independence against the university authorities. Further, the mendicants had the art of attracting many lads to their Order at the expense of the schools and the secular teachers, and this was naturally resented.

Moorman holds that it was the Franciscan devotion to Theology (rather than the Arts) which gave chief impulse to the founding and growth of the theological faculty at Cambridge. When Oxford was suspect as infected with the Wyclifite heresy, Cambridge enjoyed the confidence of the orthodox and knew how to exploit it—and not least the Franciscans. So the friary continued on its conservative course until the Dissolution, contributing but few to the party of the Reformation. Out of its ruins rose the new foundations of Trinity and Sidney Sussex colleges.

Dr. Little once wrote: "The Franciscans deserved well of Cambridge. To the town they gave a water supply; to the University they gave its Faculty of Theology; and Pembroke College owes its foundation to their initiative." Today, all that is left is an old wall in the garden of Sidney

Sussex, some stones transferred to the walls of Trinity, a few scattered manuscripts, and a conduit which still brings water into town.

The volume has several appendices, including an alphabetical list, with notes, of the Grey Friars of Cambridge, so far as they are known by name.

PERCY V. NORWOOD

*Seabury-Western
Theological Seminary*

Zwingli and Bullinger. Translated with Introduction and Notes by G. W. BROMILEY, Ph. D., D. Litt., (Vol XXIV The Library of Christian Classics). The Westminster Press. 1953. \$5.00.

This book, together with Cyril Richardson's *Early Christian Fathers*, constitutes the beginning of the projected twenty-six volume *Library of Christian Classics* to be published by the Westminster Press. John Baillie, John T. McNeill and Henry P. Van Dusen are the general editors. The editor of this volume is the Rector of St. Thomas' Episcopal Church, Edinburgh.

The whole Christian world should hail this series with enthusiasm. Much that will be included in this Library either never has been translated into English or else it is in books long since out of print. The titles of the volumes indicate a very wise selection of the more significant Christian classics from the early Christian Church through the Protestant Reformation. The possession and use of the entire series will be imperative for all who would be thoroughly informed.

As for this particular volume, Dr. Bromiley has preceded and interspersed the translations from the writings of Zwingli and Bullinger with exceptionally informing notes, biographical, expository and critical. All of these are very readable and really interesting. The total result is such that the layman or the clergyman will in no way be repelled because he has the superficial impression that here is a

compend of technical materials of no interest to a practical man of affairs.

The selections from Zwingli include: Of the Clarity and Certainty of the Word of God; Of the Education of Youth; Of Baptism; On the Lord's Supper; and An Exposition of the Faith. From Bullinger but one selection is made: Of the Holy Catholic Church. Preceding the translated text, in each instance, the editor-translator presents a succinct discussion or commentary which acts as a key for the understanding of the text. The biographical sketches of both Zwingli and Bullinger indicate wide and accurate knowledge of the available materials and are, in themselves, gems of that type of writing.

It is very easy to dismiss such men as Zwingli and Bullinger as though they had no contributions for the present and future. In any case, we still have a considerable portion of Christendom known as the Reformed Churches, whose basic assumptions spring in part out of the thinking of these two men. What a tragedy if Reformed churchmen do not know such founders and, almost as tragic, what a pity if other church people and leaders, in general, misjudge their neighbors because of their own ignorance.

The bibliography pertaining to each of these two men is very complete, listing editions, translations and secondary works. The index gives the names, the subjects and the Biblical references, thus making the work one whose riches can easily be discovered.

GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER
Western Theological Seminary

God Hidden and Revealed. The Interpretation of Luther's Deus Absconditus and its Significance for Religious Thought. By JOHN DILLENBERGER. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953. xxiv and 193 pages. \$2.50.

As its subtitle indicates, this is in many ways a history of theological history; for it analyzes the way historians of theology and systematicians

have interpreted Luther's concept of the hidden God. Skimming very rapidly over Orthodoxy, the Enlightenment, and Schleiermacher, Prof. Dillenberger concentrates on developments from Ritschl to Barth. Despite initial appearances, this is by no means a specialized monograph, intended to illumine a very small area; instead, the author finds in the tension between the hiddenness and the revealedness of God as taught by Luther a key to many changes in the theology of the past century.

A careful study of this material will illumine the origins of what Dillenberger terms "neo-Reformation theology" and will help the reader to understand both contemporary Luther-scholarship and present-day German and Swiss theology better. When read alongside Edgar Carlson's *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (1948), which treats of Swedish Luther-study, this volume will provide the English-speaking reader with a summary of works to which he might otherwise have no access. And since it is marked by a more cordial interpretation of Karl Barth than one usually finds in American theological works, it will also round out the picture of current theological debate for such a reader, who can find much of Brunner but little of Barth in English translation.

Ritschl and Ritschlians like Harnack and Loofs were prevented by their moralism and their inadequate view of revelation from taking the *deus absconditus* seriously enough. Karl Holl, Rudolf Otto, and the two Seebergs, Reinhold and Erich, made significant contributions to an explication of this concept, as did others. But from the author's presentation it is clear that in his eyes the Christocentric approach of Barth, while occasionally critical of Luther, has actually succeeded best in capturing the spirit of Luther's stress upon the fact that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is simultaneously hidden and revealed in him and in his cross.

There are several aspects of Luther's concept upon which, it seems to

me, neither Barth nor Dillenberger lays sufficient emphasis. For one thing, Luther's theology stresses not merely Christ and his cross, but the cross of Christ as the means by which God effected the forgiveness of sins. And therefore for Luther, God is hidden not only because he is the Creator, qualitatively distinct from the finite creature, but because of sin. A failure to observe this distinction in Luther leads to a misinterpretation of his doctrine of God as well as of his doctrine of man. Not man *qua* man alone, but man *qua* sinner is he to whom the vision of God is denied. Except for occasional comments (e.g., p. 121), Dillenberger pays little attention to this issue; if he had worked more with Luther directly—only the presentation on pp. 148-152 operates at length with Luther himself rather than with his interpreters—he might have given more room to it. Nor does Dillenberger consider the importance of Luther's view of the sacraments, which men like Erich Sommerlath have shown to have considerable relevance in just this context.

With one judgment, I am sure, many readers of *Church History* will heartily agree: "Short of the publication of the classics of Christian theology, the time for a more complete and penetrating history of theology [than Harnack, Seeberg, and McGiffert] is long overdue, particularly in America" (p. 145, n. 2). When such a history is written, its author would do well to copy the profound and sensitive techniques of interpretation that are hidden behind and revealed in this slender volume.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN
The University of Chicago

Thomas Becon and the Reformation in England. By DERRICK S. BAILEY. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952. 155 pp. 15s.

Thomas Becon, who was the chief propagandist for the Protestant cause in the English Reformation and whose works for many years were "best-sellers," has fallen into almost com-

plete oblivion. This fact provided the excuse for this doctoral dissertation. Unfortunately, the author found Becon's language, spirit, and theology offensive, and he has, therefore, been unable to provide the understanding and sympathetic interpretation that is greatly to be desired. Becon, to be sure, is far from an heroic figure, but he did have sufficient reason for his intemperate outbursts during the Marian Exile. Bailey apparently has been misled at this point by accepting uncritically the unsupported conjectures of Christina Garrett.

The chief value of Becon's voluminous works is that they were written for the humbler supporters of the Reformation and thus serve to reflect their views. As Bailey has pointed out, in Becon's writings "we hear the echoes not of debates in Convocation but of sermons at Paul's Cross and other well-frequented preaching places, not of theological discussion at the table of some prelate or Doctor but of earnest talk and careful searchings of the scriptures as friends gather round the fire-side or walk in the garden." Nor should Becon's influence on popular piety be minimized. Several of his devotional works went through numerous editions, and of the fifty-three prayers in the Primer of 1553, no less than forty-three were by Becon. Moreover, Becon's oft-expressed scorn for those time-servers and "gross gossellers" who "have the holy scriptures swimming in their lips and God's book either in their hands or hanging at their girdles" and yet deny the Gospel in their lives, being only "stout disciples of Christ so long as Christ feedeth them with bread," reflects an attitude which has been too little taken into account in many of the general interpretations of the sixteenth century. He denounced the new nobility, the greedy gentry, and the speculators of the cities in withering terms, and in contrast to them provided an appealing picture of the godly man in *The Sick Man's Salve*. Of more than antiquarian interest is Becon's little treatise on *The New Policy of War*, in which he sets forth the thesis that, while due preparation must not be

neglected, a "nation's destiny is always in the hands of God, and only those who serve him faithfully can hope for victory and peace."

An intriguing speculation is aroused by the incidental reference to the provision which had been made by Edmund Gonville, Rector of Rushworth, in the founding of the College of St. John the Evangelist. The priests of the community were to hold the property "on condition of strict obedience to statutes and regulations ordained by their founder." This was in 1342, little more than two decades before Wyclif sought to universalize the principle with his theory of dominion.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

Bernese Anabaptists and Their American Descendants. By DELBERT L. GRATZ. Herald Press, Scottsdale, Pa., 1953, vii, p. 219. (Illustrated), \$2.75.

Numerous monographs, mostly in the German language, have been written on the Swiss Anabaptists. An outstanding source collection and objective interpretation of the same is still Ernst Müller's *Geschichte der Bernischen Täufer* (1895). C. Henry Smith's *The Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania* (Norristown, Pa., 1929), although mostly concerned with the American aspect, could be considered a pioneer presentation of this subject matter in the English language. Gratz's research constitutes the continuation of Smith's beginning and his book is a sequel in the English language of what Müller presented in German. However, he goes far beyond both of them by checking Müller's archival sources independently, adding new ones and filling gaps between Müller's account pertaining mostly to the sixteenth century Anabaptists and Smith's narrative with emphasis on the American scene.

A glance at the table of contents of the book may leave the impression of a somewhat stereotyped approach, but upon reading the book one finds the pages filled with life. The author takes the reader with the harassed and

persecuted Anabaptists from the Canton of Bern (Emmenthal, Jura Mountains, etc.) to Alsace, Palatinate, Prussia, Volhynia, Holland, the American middle west, the prairie states, and the Pacific coast. These migrations began during the sixteenth century and were continued to the second half of the past century. Naturally the scope and the field covered in the book are too wide to present all branches and groups in detail on some two hundred pages. The book presents a bird's-eye view of the beginning, spread, and development of the Bernese Anabaptists. That some groups are treated in greater detail than others may be a matter of preference or availability of source material.

Numerous footnotes, extensive references to sources, a bibliography, an index, and appropriate illustrations are helpful aids for the specialist in the field as well as the layman. One is impressed by the diligent search of the author for all possible available source material in the field, not only in the official archives of Switzerland but also in the private libraries and family genealogies of the old country and America. However, at least one very significant source is still left for a thorough investigation in this connection. These are the archives of the Mennonite Church of Amsterdam, listed in the *Inventaris der Archiefstukken* by J. G. de Hoop Scheffer (Vol. I, 1883), the list of which alone consists of nearly three hundred pages. This material is now available to American scholars in microfilms. One is a little surprised to find in a footnote (p. 30) the statement "The name 'Mennonite' has come into such widespread general use . . . that it is a proper name to designate modern descendants of Swiss Anabaptists" and then see the author refer with great regularity not only to the Mennonites in Switzerland but also in America as "Anabaptists."

This minor criticism does not minimize the fact that Gratz's book not only fills a wide gap pertaining to the background and spread of the Swiss

Mennonites but fills it so well that it will remain the standard book in the field for times to come.

CORNELIUS KRAHN

Bethel College

CLINTON ROSSITER, *Seedtime of the Republic: The Origin of the American Tradition of Political Liberty*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953. Pp. xvi & 558.

This bulky volume traces the sources and development of the Revolutionary philosophy of ethical, ordered liberty that was the product of long generations of experience. The material is organized under three headings: "The Circumstances," "The Men," and "The Heritage." The first part describes the relationship of colonial government, religion, economy, society, and the colonial mind to the rise of liberty; the total environment is shown to be extremely favorable to its rise. The second part of the work is biographical, dealing with the lives and ideas of six leaders: Hooker, Williams, Wise, Mayhew, Bland and Franklin. Part 3 is a systematic presentation of the political theory of the American Revolution. The work as a whole is a stimulating and readable interpretation based on an extensive study of the sources.

Readers of *Church History* will be greatly interested in the attention that Professor Rossiter gives to religion; though they may find themselves questioning certain details of interpretation they cannot but feel that the author has correctly emphasized the importance of religious factors in the development of the American philosophy of liberty. Something of the thoroughness of Rossiter's discussions can be glimpsed through such passages as his summary of the relationship of Puritanism to democracy:

This was the legacy of Puritanism, especially of Congregational Puritanism, to American democracy: the contract and all its corollaries; the higher law as something more than a "brooding omnipresence in the sky"; the concept of the competent and responsible individual; certain key ingredients of economic individualism; the insistence on a citizenry

educated to understand its rights and duties; and the middle-class virtues, that high plateau of moral stability on which, so Americans believe, successful democracy must always build. When we recall that the Presbyterian, Baptist, Reformed, and even early Anglican churches in the colonies were likewise Calvinistic, there can be no argument that here was the major religious element in the rise of an American brand of liberty. (P. 55.)

And it is a striking thing that four of the six men whom he styles as "the most notable political thinkers in the colonial period" were Protestant ministers and the fifth a prominent layman.

On the whole, his treatment of these leaders of thought is fair and sympathetic. It is unfortunate that the treatment of Roger Williams is marred by an incorrect understanding of his religious teachings as "essentially negative in character" and the confusion of "seeker" with "sceptic." It is difficult to see how Williams' *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health* can be made to evidence "an essentially humanistic opinion of the nature of man" in view of the content of that tract and the researches of Mauro Calamandrei, Winthrop Hudson, and Perry Miller. The chapters on Hooker and Wise are most useful; the treatment of Mayhew seems to imply that that eminent divine could be an ardent patriot because he had moved so far from Calvinism, whereas it can easily be shown from Rossiter's own pages (e.g., cf. pp. 328-30) that many who ardently espoused the cause of freedom remained theologically orthodox.

This thoughtful work strongly emphasizes, then, "the deep strain of piety in the philosophy of American liberty" (p. 432), and makes an important contribution to the sound understanding of the place of religion in the colonial and Revolutionary periods. The book of course deals with many other things that cannot receive comment here; suffice it to note that although he has correctly stressed the sober, cautious, restrained nature of Revolutionary political faith, he has perhaps overemphasized its "conservatism" and neglected its "liberalism"

(the former is cited many times in the index, while the latter is not mentioned!). But this well-written, impressively-documented book merits careful consideration.

ROBERT T. HANDY
Union Theological Seminary

Our English Bible in the Making
By HERBERT GORDON MAY. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1952. 154 pp. \$2.75.

This book, recommended text for a National Council of Churches Leadership Education Course, presents a survey of the history of the English Bible. The history is brought up to date in its main outlines, with especially interesting indications of ways in which recent discoveries like the Dead Sea Scrolls have thrown light upon the understanding and translation of the biblical text. How changes in language have affected the intelligibility of past translations is also effectively illustrated, particularly with specific comparison of the terminology of the King James and Revised Standard Versions. The author writes with the avowed purpose of impelling the reader to a greater religious appreciation and use of the Bible through a better knowledge of its history, and he makes explicit something of this purpose in a concluding chapter on "Making Use of Our English Bible." Helpful bibliographical references are provided for those who would read further in the subject and related areas.

In a sense the volume also constitutes an apologia for the Revised Standard Version—or, one might better say, for any version which attempts to provide the most accurate and intelligible English text possible. As an active member of the Old Testament section of the Revised Standard Version Committee, Professor May is able to provide interesting, personal glimpses of the methods and problems of translator and reviser. He rightly feels that a knowledge of the history of translation would help to obviate much of the cavilling criticism directed against modern revi-

sions, or, at least would enable readers of such to recognize its real motivation and true worth! May's account is also suggestive of how closely the fortunes of the English Bible in its early years were tied to important ecclesiastical and political figures and events. For, as he indicates, "Most of these translations were part and parcel of the spirit of the Reformation." The historian of the period can gain much, therefore, from an acquaintance with the story of the rise and development of vernacular versions of the Scriptures. The size and scope of the present volume unfortunately here does not permit an adequate presentation of various relevant factors such as derive from the Renaissance with the rise of universities and revival of Hebrew and Greek studies, and from recent developments in linguistic research. Only a half-page, for example, is given to the Greek of the New Testament, and not much more than a page to its textual criticism.

A few observations in this latter area need modification. In the classification of manuscripts the indebtedness of Westcott and Hort to predecessors might have been indicated. Actually, the Revisers of 1881 did not consistently use the Westcott-Hort text as is implied, and it is too much to say that "today it is possible to go far

beyond Westcott and Hort." In *The Introduction To The Revised Standard New Testament* it is pointed out by Professor Grant that the operation of the "eclectic method" led the Revised Standard Version Committee to choose readings which brought them closer to the Westcott-Hort text [i.e., in comparison with the Revised Version], but "rarely beyond it." An analysis of their work confirms this. The "International New Testament Manuscripts Project" is not directly concerned with the preparation of a new "critical edition" of the text as stated on pages 86 and 101, but only with as full a critical apparatus of readings as possible. Tischendorf published more than eight editions of the text, the reference here (p. 65) being to his eighth major critical edition. We might also say that practically all significant work on text was done since the King James Version rather than "a great deal." There are a few other somewhat questionable generalizations such as inevitably occur when a large subject has to be treated in a relatively small space, but for the average reader they will not affect the chief purpose and value of the book.

ALLEN WIKGREN

University of Chicago

SURVEYS

(Continued from page 329)

F. ADDENDA

We should mention A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Interpreter of the Old Testament* (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1952), and two articles in the *Revue biblique* for this year. The first, by D. Barthélemy

(pp. 18-29), reports the discovery of Greek fragments of the minor prophets (first century of our era) with a text very close to that of Justin Martyr. The second, by J. T. Milik (pp. 276-94) publishes a letter of Bar-Kochba in which he tells a subordinate to stop associating with the Galileans—presumably Christians, although this is not quite certain.

of

N

of
ts
xt
r.
5-
oa
op
e-
is



